Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor-1875_1925_4

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. IV.

THE EXPOSITOR

NINTH SERIES

Volume IV

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, LIMITED
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXXV

Ser. 9
v. 4
1925:2

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Butler & Tanner Ltd., *Frome and London*

CURRENT ISSUES.

A THIRD series of Dr. S. Schechter's *Studies in Judaism* has been issued in America. It is a posthumous publication, a selection from published and unpublished material, and barely comes up to the standard of its two predecessors. Yet Dr. Schechter had learning and strong convictions. His writing had generally an edge upon it. And this volume is certainly welcome.

* * * * *

Two of the studies are biographical. Dr. Schechter reviews the careers of Zunz and Geiger, admiring both but naturally criticizing Geiger. Both Zunz and Geiger did yeoman service as apologists for Judaism in Germany during last century. Yet Geiger seems to Dr. Schechter a Jewish Broad Churchman in his theology. For Geiger refused to be bound by rabbinic Judaism. His great hope was that Judaism as the perfect ethical monotheism would one day become the religion of all men, and this he regarded as the mission of Jews in the world. He threw over belief in any coming Messiah; he would not hear of any return of the Jews to Palestine; he desired to strip Israel of its local and nationalistic trappings, in order to equip it for its true inward mission to humanity. No more severe words could be uttered against Zionism than Geiger poured out. He even disparaged the study of the Hebrew language, against which, he candidly admitted, "History has given her judgment."

* * * * *

In some respects history has, for the time being, given its verdict against Geiger. Zionism has acquired a vogue. And the recrudescence of nationalism has affected the self-consciousness of Judaism. Dr. Schechter, however, opposes Geiger's conception of Judaism as nationalistic, and sees no hope whatever for Judaism if it puts the religious teaching of Israel above

its religious life. He seems even to agree with Zunz's remark that for Judaism to abolish the rite of circumcision would mean suicide.

* * * * *

What then is Schechter's outlook for his religion ? The only hope seems to be a re-assertion of traditional Judaism, and a stern refusal to recognize anything in the shape of Christianity. He protests against modern reform—Jews paying tribute to "the sweet rabbi of Nazareth," and against some Jewish platforms "on which Christ has become a subject for sermons and orations as in any Unitarian Church." He seems to be alarmed at the ebb from modern Judaism, partly due to this liberalizing movement. "The world has not shown the least sign that it is prepared to be converted to Judaism, except the few proselytes we get through intermarriage. But certainly all statistics point to the fact that we have lost, during the last century, more men and women to Christianity than in any age especially distinguished by persecution." And when we turn over Dr. Schechter's pages to discover how Judaism is to remedy this state of things, we find that it is to be by stiffening Jewish traditions, by abjuring any concession to Christianity, and by reviving the nationalistic rites and practices of Israel.

* * * * *

In the Fourth Gospel there are editorial notes or explanations of certain sayings. A remark of Jesus is sometimes followed by a sort of parenthetical comment, indicating what our Lord meant. Now it has been often pointed out that these explanations are not invariably accurate, and Dr. F. J. Badcock, of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, shares this view. He has published a book of *Reviews and Studies*, partly of doctrinal subjects and partly exegetical. One of these papers is upon "Christ as Seer," and in the course of it he deals with one or two of the Johannine sayings, separating them from their appended explanations.

* * * * *

In the second chapter, for example, when Jesus said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," was He alluding to His own resurrection. The note says so: "He spake of the temple of His body." But we are not bound by

the interpretations offered in such editorial comments, says Dr. Badcock; what the "temple" symbolized was the Jewish religion, in course of being destroyed by Jews who would not recognize their real Messiah.

* * * * *

Another instance is selected from the last chapter, where Jesus tells Peter that "when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thine hands and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." Now the editorial comment on this is that Jesus said this "signifying what death he should die." Can girding up the loins, etc., be possibly applied to crucifixion? Surely not, Dr. Badcock argues. What Jesus foretold was that Peter would require to be braced up by another disciple of stronger spiritual fibre. And the prediction was fulfilled, "closely fulfilled by the meeting with St. Paul at Antioch. St. Peter failed through feebleness, and St. Paul braced him up, stiffened him, as we should say, and carried him in the opposite direction to his natural inclination."

* * * * *

But in the same paper a still more revolutionary suggestion is offered. Dr. Badcock anticipates that it will be "rejected by many"; nevertheless it deserves to be mentioned as a novel interpretation of an old text. The text is the Rock-saying, "on this rock will I build my church, etc." We all know the various directions taken by theories about this passage, but no one would guess what Dr. Badcock proposes. Take these words out of their present context in Matthew's Gospel, he says; they were not spoken by Jesus to Peter, but by the Father to our Lord Himself, perhaps at the baptism. The Church is not built on any man's faith or confession, but on Jesus Christ its one foundation. When the words are read in this sense, they yield a consistent meaning. In their original form they were: "Thus saith the Lord to me, 'Thou art the rock whereon I will build my Church and against thee the gates of death shall have no power and [after the Resurrection] I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven [power of sending the Holy Ghost], and whatsoever thou shalt bind shall be bound, and whatsoever thou shalt loose shall be loosed'" [referring to our Lord as universal Judge].

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

Articles by Professor Welch in the EXPOSITOR, December, 1913, and May, 1923.

The question raised: Have the main pillars of the modern view been shaken?

The answer to be found in the re-interrogation of the facts.

A. The Analysis of the Pentateuch.

I. The Problem. Prof. Orr. The phenomena to be explained.
   1. Duplicate narratives.
   2. Accompanying distinctive use of the Divine Names.
   3. Their distribution. Two Tables.
   4. Accompanying phraseology and outlook—illustrations.

II. The Solution, slowly and laboriously built up.
   1. Simon, Astruc, etc., etc.
   2. The evidence, literary and historical.
   3. The theory in a nutshell.

III. This theory in its turn criticized.
   1. Orr.
   2. Eerdmans, Dahse.

Note.—The Pentateuch doesn't claim Mosaic authorship. Sellin's verdict.

Supplementary note on the use of Elohim in the Pentateuch (with special reference to Baumgärtel on Elohim outside the Pentateuch).

Article 1. A PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION.

IN all departments of scientific research, it is desirable from time to time to pause and take stock of the actual position. In the articles which follow an attempt has been made to survey some of the recent work in the department of Old Testament study and to estimate its worth. Those who know the wide extent of the area which may be included under that head, and therefore of the literature devoted to its investigation, will appreciate the necessity of confining the scope of the present discussion within manageable limits. Those limits are in this case determined by two considerations. In the first place I write

in the interests of those Bible-students who live busy lives and who have little leisure to give to the following of the intricacies of scholarly investigation. Many such have been puzzled by recent categorical assertions that the very bases of the teaching which has been current at our Universities for the last generation or so have been 'seriously shaken,' and they may welcome an attempt to test the real state of the case and to express the result arrived at in, as far as possible, untechnical language.* In the second place it was an article by Prof. A. C. Welch, published in the EXPOSITOR in May, 1923, under the title, "On the Present Position of Old Testament Criticism," which ultimately led me to take up the task of preparing these articles. In his article Prof. Welch alludes to many of the problems which are now being keenly debated, and I propose for the most part to confine myself to the issues which he has raised and to follow the order in which he has raised them. This has the disadvantage that it gives excessive prominence to the discussion over the use of the Divine names, but it has also its advantage. It concentrates attention on certain definite issues. Readers of this series of articles are therefore asked to note that the articles are not an independent presentation of the facts upon which our judgment as to the dominant hypothesis must be based. If they were, both proportion and contents would be different. They simply seek to deal with the actual issues raised by the article of May, 1923.

It will help us better to understand these issues, if we note that this article is the second which Prof. Welch has published under the same title. The first was published in the EXPOSITOR of December, 1913. In it the lecturer

* Having in view in the main this type of student, I have as a rule referred to works which have been published in English and which are therefore accessible to all.

criticized the view of the course of Hebrew *history* and of the development of Hebrew *religion*, which had been set forth by "the School which passes under the name of Wellhausen." He sought to emphasize "the distinctive character of Israel's religion" and the antiquity of much of Israel's law and custom. But at the same time he was careful to point out that "the scheme [i.e. "the Wellhausen theory"] in its broad features still holds the field, and even many of its detailed results are proved." "There is, e.g., no serious effort to go back to the position that Deuteronomy in its present form is Mosaic, in the sense of dating from the time of the Exodus. Now that is the crux of the position, for to put Deuteronomy late is to recognize that the law, in the form in which we have the law, comes after instead of before the writing prophets." All that he claims is that the theory "must modify itself and remain supple enough to make room for the new facts and the new light on old facts which are being thrust upon our notice.*

In 1923 the Professor seems to go much further. He now asserts that "the three cardinal positions of modern criticism" have been "seriously shaken." These three positions are stated by him as follows: (i) "the analysis of Genesis and of the Pentateuch into three (*sic*) main sources, which were afterwards combined into one"; (2) "the book of Deuteronomy, if not in its present, at least in its original, form, was first brought to light in 621 by King Josiah, when it was used as a basis for an effort at reform in the national religion"; and (3) "Ezra, about 440, pledged the body of returned exiles to a new lawbook, the Priestly

* The willingness of scholars to do this is recognized by Prof. Welch in his 1923 article, p. 346, "Modifications in its original statement have been continually made to meet objections." (And this still holds good. It is not a rigid orthodoxy by any means.) It is somewhat perplexing to find side by side with this a description of the theory as "rigid and inelastic" (pp. 369 and 358).

Code, so called because it transformed the people from a civil to an ecclesiastical community, organized under a high-priest instead of under a king."

The chief value of this second article consists in the fact that it presents in summary and readable form a contention, which has been advanced by various writers during the last twenty or twenty-five years, viz. that the current theory of the Pentateuch is in a precarious condition. Premising that the modern view of the Old Testament "has passed from the position of an extreme heresy into that of a new orthodoxy," Prof. Welch proceeds to marshal reasons which have been advanced for questioning the soundness of its dogmas.* It is well that we should be called upon from time to time to examine foundations. We thank him therefore for throwing down this challenge and we take it up, not in the spirit of antagonism, but in the interests of truth. Is it the fact that the main pillars of "the modern view" have been "seriously shaken"? Are the reasons given strong and broad enough to justify such a statement? If they are, what better theory has Dr. Welch, or any of the writers whom he quotes, to put in its place?

Dr. Hort, in his Introduction to *The New Testament in Greek* (vol. ii, p. 323 f.), has well expressed the spirit in which we desire to undertake this quest for truth: "An implicit confidence in all truth, a keen sense of its variety and a deliberate dread of shutting out truth as unknown . . . quench every inclination to guide criticism into delivering such testimony as may be to the supposed advantage of truth already inherited or acquired. Critics of the Bible, if they have been taught by the Bible are unable to forget

* This second article was originally an inaugural address at the opening of a New College session. I cannot help thinking that its more provocative statements are due to a desire to awaken certain students from critical slumbers and should not be taken *au grand sérieux.*

that the duty of guileless workmanship is never superseded by any other."

It will be convenient if we consider the matter at issue under Dr. Welch's three heads: A. The Analysis of the Pentateuch. B. The Date of Deuteronomy. C. The Date and Nature of the Priestly Code. The first of these will be considered in the first three articles.

We take then, first:

A. The Literary Analysis of the Pentateuch.

I. *The Problem.*

Let us begin by noting what, broadly speaking, is the Problem to be explained. For there is a Problem. It was not without good reason that Prof. Orr called his well-known book *The Problem of the Old Testament.* On page 8, after giving a long list of men who combined modern critical views with the full belief in supernatural revelation, he writes: "the attitude to criticism of so large a body of believing scholars may at least suggest to those disposed to form hasty judgments that there is here *a very real problem* to be solved; that the case is more complex than perhaps they had imagined; that there are *real phenomena* in the literary structure of the Old Testament, for the explanation of which, in the judgment of many able minds, the traditional view is not adequate." What are these "real phenomena"? We can only indicate in the most summary way a few of them.

1. As long ago as 1680 Father Simon drew attention to the presence in Genesis of duplicate narratives of the same events, e.g. those of the Creation, of the Flood, and of Abram (Abraham) and Sarai (Sarah) (Gen. 12^{10-20} in Egypt, 20^{1-17} in Gerar, cp. Isaac and Rebekah in 26^{6-11}).

2. Seventy years later Astruc, another Frenchman, pointed out that these duplicate narratives were marked

by the use of distinctive names for God. In one set the Divine Name is Elohim (God), in the other it is YHWH (Jehovah or Yahweh, represented in our EV by 'the LORD' or occasionally GOD). In Genesis 2 and 3 the two names are combined: Yahweh Elohim (the LORD God). Yahweh is of course a proper noun, the particular name of the God of Israel. Elohim is used both as a proper name of the one true God (as in Gen. 1^1–2^3, 35 times), and as an appellative, i.e. a common or generic name (as e.g. 'the God of Abraham' and 'the LORD (Heb. Yahweh) thy God'). It is only when used as a proper name that it comes within our purview. The occurrences in the Hebrew text of the two names so defined may be tabulated as follows :—

TABLE I.

	Elohim.	Yahweh.	Yahweh Elohim.	Adonai Y.
Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15}	178*	146†	20	2
Ex. 3^{16}–end .	44	393	1	
Leviticus . .	0	311		
Numbers . .	10	365		
Deuteronomy .	7	548		2
	239	1,763	21	4

The point to be noticed in this Table is the remarkable change which takes place as soon as Ex. 3^{13-15} is reached. How is it to be explained? That is the Problem in its simplest form. But before attempting to solve it, we must go into greater detail. The following Table sets forth the *distribution* of the names in Genesis and Exodus. It will be observed that in many parts the two names occur (so to speak) in patches,‡ while in others they are intermingled.

* For a possible modification of the figures in this column, see the supplementary note at the end of the article.

† This figure (146) includes the Divine Name embedded in the place-name "Jehovah jireh" (Gen. 22^{14}).

‡ Note especially 1^1–2^3, 10^1–17^{1a}, 18^1–19^{28}, 24–27.

The significant fact is that in a number of instances the patches coincide with duplicate narratives.

TABLE II.

Genesis.	E.	Y.	Y.E.	A.Y.
1^{1}–2^{3}	35	0		
2^{4}–3^{24}	4 (serpent)	0	20	
4	1	10		
5	5	1		
6^{1-8}	2 (sons of God)	5		
6^{9-22}	5	0		
7^{1-5}	0	2		
7^{6}–8^{19}	5	1		
8^{20-22}	0	3		
9	7	1		
10–17^{1a}	0	35	—	2
$17^{1b\text{-end}}$	7	0		
18–19	2 (19^{29})	17		
20–23	23	9 (20^{18}, $21^{1, 1, 33}$, $22^{11, 14, 14, 15, 16}$)		
24–27	2 (25^{11}, 27^{28})	33		
28	5	4		
29	0	4		
30	9	3 (30^{24-30})		
31–35	23	3 ($31^{3, 49}$, 32^{9})		
36–37	0	0		
38–39	1 (39^{9})	11		
40–50	27	1 (49^{18})		
Exodus.				
1–3^{15a}	15	3		
	—	—	—	—
	178	146	20	2
	—	—	—	—
3^{15b}–17	13	225 (+2 Yah + 1 Yahweh-Nissi)	1	
18–24	26	48		1
25–40	5	119		1
	—	—	—	—
	44	392	1	2

We note also the use of El eighteen times in such titles as El Elyon, El Shaddai, El-beth-el, El Olam, El-elohe-Israel, and in Gen. 16^{13}, 35^{1-3}, 46^{3}, 49^{25}.

4. This varied use of the Divine names is not an isolated

phenomenon. Each of the two names is associated with a whole group of phrases and terms and with a characteristic outlook, which mark off the passages in which they occur from the rest. We shall see later that, in the case of the Elohim passages, the accompanying features in different sections vary so much that scholars have long differentiated between two documents, both using Elohim systematically up to Ex. 3^{15} and 6^{2-3} respectively, but in other respects markedly different.*

II. *The Solution Presented by the Dominant Hypothesis.*

What intelligent men require, when their attention has been drawn to such facts as the above, is a theory which will explain them in a reasonable manner. Now a theory has been slowly and laboriously built up in the course of the last 250 years, which has commended itself to an increasing number of scholars, and large agreement upon certain main lines has been arrived at. As far back as 1680 Simon suggested that duplicate narratives in Genesis must be due to two different authors, whose writings had

* (*a*) The use of Elohim in Gen. 1^{1}–2^{4a} and similar passages is associated with such phrases as "These are the generations of" (2^{4a}, 6^{9}+8 times and see 5^{1}); "be fruitful and multiply" ($1^{22, 28}$+9 times); "after their families" (8^{19}+4 times, also Ex. 3 times, Nu. 46, Josh. 31—all in passages assigned to the Priestly document; only elsewhere Nu. 11^{10a} (J), 1 Sam. 10^{21}, 1 Chron. 5^{7}, $6^{62f.}$ (=Josh. $21^{33, 40}$); etc. [For full list see Driver's *Introduction*, pp. 131 ff.] (*b*) The use of Yahweh similarly is associated with special phrases: "the angel of Yahweh" (16^{7}, etc.); "call upon the name of Yahweh" (4^{26}+4 times+Ex. 34^{5}); comfort (Heb. *nāham*, 5^{29}+6 times; not elsewhere in Pentateuch in this sense); etc. (*c*) The second series of passages using Elohim has also its phrases, such as "the angel of Elohim" (21^{17}+3 times+Ex. 14^{19}); 'baal'= owner, husband, citizen, etc. (20^{3}+16 times in Pentateuch); Horeb (Ex. 3^{1}+5 times and so Deut. 9 times; not elsewhere in the Pentateuch); etc. These last two series of passages (generally known as J and E) closely correspond both in contents (from chap. 20) and style, and it would be easy to give a long list of contrasts between the phrasoology of 'P' and of 'J E.' The references in this note are to usages in Genesis only, unless otherwise stated, because it is only in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15a} and 6^{2} that the distinctive use of Elohim is in force.

been put together by Moses. Astruc (1753) suggested that Moses had used various documents, which he arranged in four parallel columns. The two principal documents could be distinguished by their use of Elohim and of Yahweh respectively. The other ten were but fragments, derived probably from the Midianites. All these documents were subsequently amalgamated into one. But an indiscriminate following of the Divine names as the sole clue would have led to confusion, and Eichhorn (1780) carried the theory a stage further by showing that in the large majority of cases the two Divine names were each accompanied by their own style and vocabulary. Working on these lines Ilgen (1798) pointed to duplicate narratives and distinct vocabularies within the Elohistic portion of Genesis. There were in Genesis, he said, two writers who used Elohim only. Geddes, a Scotchman (1792, 1800), and Vater (1802) carried the analysis into the rest of the Hexateuch and regarded the latter as a collection of fragments, which could not be classified into groups. De Wette (1806) compared the institutions described in the Pentateuch with the references to religious usages in Judges, Samuel and Kings, and in a striking chapter of his *Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament* took up the question of Deuteronomy. He showed that its favourite phrases and ideals and its formulated laws pointed to an authorship and date different from that of the rest of the Pentateuch, and he assigned it to the seventh century B.C.* Ewald (1843) analysed the Pentateuch into (1) early fragments, including a Book of Covenants ; (2) A Book of Origins, dating from the time of Solomon, which formed the framework (and answered more or less to the modern Priestly code) ; (3) Three prophetic documents (answering to J and E) ; (4) Deuteronomy.

* For Deuteronomy see later article.

Hupfeld (*The Sources of Genesis*, 1853), working on the lines of Ilgen, but independently, argued cogently for the existence of two writers using the name Elohim in preference to YHWH, and showed how closely related one of them was to the Yahwist writer, so much so that they were in his opinion combined (= JE) before being attached to P and D. He thus prepared the way for the next step, viz. the dating of the so-called 'Book of Origins' after, instead of before, Deuteronomy. Reuss (1833), and still more his pupil Graf (1865–6), Kuenen (1861, 1869) and others led in this direction, and Wellhausen (1876, 1878) and Kuenen (1885) argued so powerfully for a post-exilic date for the publication of the Priestly Code, as it came to be called, that their conclusion has come to be accepted by the great bulk of younger scholars from that time onwards. Finally, later research has enriched the documentary theory by recognizing within the four documents incorporated early fragments (e.g. Gen. 6^{1-4}),* early laws and groups of laws,† later additions in the style characteristic of each document ‡ and editorial matter. As the theory involves the work of editors who combined J and E, JE and D, and JED and P, it is obvious that, if the theory be true, additions and modifications due to these men would reveal themselves to the careful student. And such passages can clearly be seen. Some writers, like Mr. H. M. Wiener, make merry over the resort to editors (or 'redactors') to explain certain phenomena, but, when they come to produce a theory of their

* Prof. Welch (p. 350) speaks of 'the old exploded fragmentary theory.' Is it altogether exploded? Sir G. A. Smith (*Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, p. 36) writes: "the justness of much of the reasoning connected with this hypothesis has been proved by more recent scholars."

† E.g. Deut. 21^{1-9} (see Carpenter and Harford's edition of the *Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 267–8).

‡ See Carpenter and Harford, vol. i, pp. 141 and foll., and Sir G. A. Smith (as in note *), pp. 41–2.

own, they are obliged to resort to the same explanation (see, e.g., Dahse, p. 18 below, and Wiener, *Contributions to a New Theory*, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1918, pp. 82 ff.; *Religion of Moses*, p. 19; *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, p. 4).

The evidence for this analysis and dating of documents was at the outset literary, but in the hands of Wellhausen and other writers, both on the Continent and in Great Britain, it became also increasingly historical. The Pentateuchal laws were compared with the evidence of custom and usage embedded in the historical and prophetical writings. Professor Robertson Smith in his lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881, 1892) brilliantly expounded the theory outlined above and set forth the broad foundations, literary and historical, upon which it was based. He claimed that "in the critical construction of the history the living God is as present as in that to which tradition had wedded us." "Criticism," he went on to say, "unfolds a living and consistent picture of the Old Dispensation; it is itself a living thing, which plants its foot upon realities and, like Dante among the shades, proves its life by moving what it touches." *

This historical account of the gradual formulation of what Prof. Welch calls "the dominant hypothesis" shows that the theory is no mere mushroom growth. It is the fruit of a prolonged study of the Old Testament, on the part of a long series of able scholars, extending over a period of two centuries and a half. It is a comprehensive effort to

* This is probably still the best book for the non-professional man, who wishes to get a clear understanding of the modern view of the Hexateuch or of the Bible. Driver's *Introduction*, Carpenter and Harford's Oxford *Hexateuch* and other books issued during the last thirty years provide for the needs of the professional student. The Oxford University Press has just issued a second edition of Dr. D. C. Simpson's *Pentateuchal Criticism*, a clear and readable setting forth of the arguments in favour of the modern view.

understand the structure of the Hexateuch and affords a most intelligible explanation of the peculiar alternations of the Divine names in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 6^{2}. If I may put the matter in a nutshell, (*a*) it found the original clue in Ex. $6^{2,3}$: "I am YHWH; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by my name YHWH was I not known to them." It went back to Genesis and it found a series of passages in which God appeared as El Shaddai (God Almighty), in which Elohim was consistently used (Gen. 17^{1} provides the one exception. Yahweh there may reasonably be regarded as due to a harmonizing editor) and in which the phraseology markedly resembled that in Ex. 6^{2-12}. It has inferred from these passages that parts of Gen.–Ex. are the work of a writer who held that the name YHWH was not known to the Patriarchs and that it was first revealed to Moses. This writer *might* use the name in his own narrative, but he *could not* put it into the mouth of the Patriarchs.* (*b*) A similar argument, based upon Ex. 3^{13-15} with its context and with corresponding passages in Genesis, has led to the inference that a second writer also held that the Divine Name YHWH was not known until it was revealed to Moses. (*c*) The existence of numerous passages in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 6^{2} in which YHWH is used and is put into the mouths of the Patriarchs is then regarded as pointing to a third writer, who believed that this name was known from the earliest times.

Here we have what seems on the face of it to be a very reasonable explanation of the remarkable change in the use of the Divine names, which takes place just at Ex. 3 and 6. In Theile's edition of the Hebrew Bible Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{13} occupies 76 pages; the rest of the Pentateuch

* Fuller reasons for this inference will be given at the beginning of the next article.

occupies a further 214 pages (the proportion being very nearly 3 to 1). In the first quarter of the whole (290 pages) Elohim by itself and as a proper name is used 178 times, while Yahweh is used 146 times; in the remaining three-quarters Elohim is used 61 times, while Yahweh is used 1,617 times. It is not that in other respects the special phraseology and ideas of J, E and P disappear; it is only that, as a rule, all three now use the name Yahweh.* The name ceases to be a mark of difference. The conclusion seems irresistible that in Gen.–Ex. we have three writers, two of whom do not regard the Divine name YHWH as known to the Patriarchs, while the third is of the contrary opinion.

This fusion of documents into one without any overt indication of the fact may seem strange in view of the practice of modern historians, but there are abundant examples of similar proceedings in ancient times. The Saxon Chronicle, the lawbook of Manu, the Diatesseron of Tatian, which weaved the four Gospels into one narrative, the Books of Chronicles in their use of Samuel and Kings and St. Matthew and St. Luke in their use of St. Mark and of 'Q,' exhibit this method.†

III. *The Solution Criticized.*

This "hypothesis," says Dr. Welch, "in the lifetime of us older men has passed from the position of an extreme heresy into that of a new orthodoxy." In other words it has become "the dominant hypothesis." There have,

* There is of course nothing theoretically to prevent a writer from continuing to use Elohim after Ex. 3 or 6 and, as a matter of fact, in a few passages Elohim is still used—e.g. Ex. 13^{17-20} (4 uses), $18^{1,\ 12-27}$ (10 in connexion with Jethro), 19–22 (13), 24 (1) and 13 times in the phrases: the angel, the rod (twice), the mount (3), the spirit (2), the finger, the work, the writing, voices (9^{28}), of God (see supplementary note). In Numbers 9 out of the 10 occurrences occur in one version of the Balaam story.

† See Carpenter and Harford, *The Hexateuch*, vol. i, pp. 4–13.

however, always been those who have criticized it from the point of view of the older orthodoxy, and within the last twenty-five years there have been others who have attacked it in the interests of a new "heresy."

As an example of the former we may take *The Problem of the Old Testament*, by the late Prof. Orr. It is important to notice that, although written in the interests of the older views, this book by no means repudiates the newer hypothesis root and branch. On page 201 the writer remarks that "in one respect this theory appears to us to mark an advance. In so far as a documentary theory is to be accepted at all—on which after—it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later than JE, for whose narratives, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the 'framework' and that it is not, as older critics held, a separate older work." Again (pp. 340–1): "In Genesis P furnishes the systematic framework. . . . In the middle books . . . JE and P appear as co-ordinate. . . . In Joshua . . . the priestly parts appear as supplementary or filling in." Finally (pp. 375–6) he uses "the term 'collaboration' to express the kind and manner of the activity which in our view brought the Pentateuchal books into their present shape . . . as indicating the labour of original composers, working with a common aim and towards a common end. . . . It may very well be . . . that (1) the original JEP history and code embraced, not simply the Book of the Covenant, but a brief summary of the Levitical ordinances . . .; possibly also a short narrative of the last discourses of Moses and of his death. (2) Deuteronomy, in its original form, was probably an independent work; (3) the priestly laws also would be at first chiefly in the hands of the priests. (4) Later, but still in our opinion early—not later than the days of the undivided Kingdom—the original work would be enlarged by

union with Deuteronomy and by incorporation of the larger mass of Levitical material. (5) In some such way, with possible revision by Ezra, or whoever else gave the work its final canonical shape, our present Pentateuch may have arisen."* He goes on to suggest that only selected portions would be copied out for general use and that the detailed Levitical code would be left to the Priests. Moreover "the versions in circulation would have their vicissitudes; would undergo the usual textual corruptions; may have received unauthorized modifications or additions; may have had their Jehovistic and Elohistic recensions." This is not the dominant theory, but also it is not by any means the traditional view of older days.

Examples of the newer theories, which certain Continental critics of the dominant hypothesis would substitute for it, may be given in briefer form. The Dutch scholar Eerdmans would analyse the Pentateuch into (1) a Book of Adam, beginning at Gen. 5^1, by a writer with polytheistic views, who amongst other characteristics uses the name Jacob for the third Patriarch; (2) an enlargement by an editor, who was also polytheistic and who preferred the name Israel to that of Jacob; (3) a new edition in a monotheistic interest after the discovery of the Book of the Law about 621 B.C.; (4) a final expansion in the post-exilic period.† Johannes Dahse, a German pastor, now in the Ruhr, a LXX scholar, has been hailed by some as one who supports the reaction towards the older views which they would fain see brought about. He certainly criticizes the dominant theory, but it is questionable whether his own theory is much more palatable from the traditional point

* I have added the numbering (1) to (5) in order to bring out clearly the successive stages through which, in Prof. Orr's opinion, the Pentateuch probably passed.

† See Sellin's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), p. 31.

of view. Starting from (1) an original document, chiefly narrative, Dahse postulates (2) Prophetic Editors, one, two or more; (3) a Liturgical Editor (whom he identifies with Ezra), who divided the book into sections for reading in public worship and introduced editorial matter, consisting of recapitulations, tables, anticipations, which largely coincide with passages assigned by most scholars to P; and (4) a Theological Editor or Editors, who took the text as it left the hands of Ezra (best represented by the LXX text) and transformed it into the present Massoretic Hebrew text.*

In succeeding articles I propose to take up one by one the criticisms made upon "the dominant hypothesis." Let me conclude this preliminary article by two quotations from Sellin's *Introduction.*

(1) "The Torah or Pentateuch . . . bears no superscription or signature indicating Moses as the author. He is for the most part spoken of in the third person, and it is expressly said that only some of the most important historical, and in particular the legislative, portions are from his hand." †

(2) "While all theories as to the number, origin and age of the different sources are only working hypotheses,

* See *A Fresh Investigation into the Sources of Genesis*, translated from the German of Johannes Dahse and published by the S.P.C.K., 1914; see also Sellin's *Introduction*, p. 27.

† See Exod. 17^{14}, 24^{4}, 34^{27}; Nu. 33^{2}; Deut. $31^{9\text{-}13,\ 22,\ 24\text{-}26}$. Genesis and Leviticus contain no allusions to the writing of them, and even Deuteronomy ($1^{1,\ 3,\ 5}$, $4^{41,\ 44}$, 5^{1}) speaks of Moses in the third person. In the light of these facts, what are we to make of the following statement by Prof. Mackay in his Introduction to Dr. Naville's *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch*, p. xvii: "It comes to us professing, expressly in four-fifths, and by implication in five-fifths, of its contents, to be of Mosaic authorship"? I believe that what the writer meant was that, taking, e.g., Lev. 1^{1}, 4^{1}, etc., 'at their face value,' a large part of the material of Leviticus must have come from Moses, because "only Moses heard the LORD speak to him." But that is *not* 'authorship' and such loose statements as the above destroy one's confidence in those that make them. The articles that follow will show why the vast majority of scholars cannot take such phrases as Lev. 1^{1} 'at their face value.'

scientifically justified as such, the one absolutely established scientific fact which emerges is that the Pentateuch grew up in the post-Mosaic period out of the combination of several sources which were written in Palestine. That is the immovable basis on which Protestant Pentateuchal criticism unanimously takes its stand at the present day" (p. 29).

Supplementary Note.

On the Use of Elohim in the Pentateuch.

In 1912 F. Baumgärtel published a monograph entitled *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuchs*, i.e. Elohim outside the Pentateuch. This monograph is very much *ad rem* in the present discussion, and many may be glad to have their attention directed to it.

Baumgärtel begins his thesis with a survey of recent writings by Dahse and others, which in one way and another threw doubt upon the soundness of the Massoretic text and the reliability of the Names of God in the Pentateuch as a basis for a critical analysis into documents. 'I become more convinced every day,' he writes, 'that the question thus raised cannot be settled by the handling of the Names of God merely within the Pentateuch. We must make a survey of the usage of each of the other books of the Old Testament and get a history of the usage outside the Pentateuch. We can then deal better with the usage within the Pentateuch. Not that the usage outside necessarily holds good within, but that, if we get the whole usage as to the Names of God before our eyes, we shall see the Pentateuchal usage in proper perspective.' Baumgärtel therefore passes under review the whole of the uses of Elohim outside the Pentateuch as a necessary 'preliminary investigation.'

We are here and now concerned only with the methods

which he uses in determining the usage of the different writers, and their bearing upon the usage within the Pentateuch. The important bearing of all this upon the question of the reliability of the Massoretic text will be set forth in Article 3, Part III.

He starts from the position which was taken up at the beginning of this article that only when Elohim is used as a Proper Noun is it significant as a possible sign of authorship. He then sets to work to separate the uses of Elohim which are appellative from the rest. He analyses the uses, and points out that Elohim in various connexions seems to have an appellative significance (i.e. a common or generic force).

He classifies the uses which he regards as appellative under the following heads :—

I. Elohim regarded as appellative on internal grounds.

1. Where it can only have this force, e.g. Yahweh, he is God ; Your God ; etc. This is far the largest class.

2. Stands for the Deity generally, e.g. The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God (Ps. $14^{1,2,5}$).

3. In antithesis to man, e.g. Will a man rob God ? (Mal. 3^{8}).

4. In general statements, e.g. shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil ? (Job 2^{10}; cp. 2 Sa. 23^{3}).

5. Meaning 'superhuman,' e.g. an exceeding great city (Jonah 3^{3}, cp. 1 Sa. 14^{15}; cp. Acts 7^{20}).

6. Where it cannot be equivalent to Yahweh, e.g. the sons of God (Job 1^{6}, 2^{1} ; cp. 1 Sa. 28^{13}).

7. In connexion with non-Israelites, e.g. Judg. 3^{20}, 1^{7}, etc.

8. Almost equivalent to the sanctuary, e.g. 1 Sa. 14^{36}, 2 Sa. 12^{16}.

II. Elohim regarded as appellative on external grounds —i.e. when a certain word stands only with E and not with

Y, or in clearly otherwise Y passages, e.g. man of God (Josh. 14^6, etc.), ark of God, etc.

III. Elohim in certain phrases.

E.g. 'So may God do to me and more also' (1 Sa. 3^{17}, etc.); '*as* the angel of God' (1 Sa. 29^9 + 4 times); contrast 'the angel of Yahweh' in Judges 19 times; and in other books 21 times.

IV. In other places—a nondescript group of possible appellatives.

V. In Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

By the application of his methods Baumgärtel reduces the number of uses of Elohim as a Proper Name *outside* the Pentateuch to very small proportions, e.g. in Josh., Jer., Ezek., 11 Minor Prophets, Prov., Ru., Lam., Ezra he finds no such uses. In the Pss. outside the Elohistic Pss. he finds only 4. In Judg. he finds 11, Sam. 6, Kings 5, Isa. 1, Jonah 8, Job 1, Neh. 5, and Chron. 48, and he is doubtful whether all of these are Proper names.

In my judgment Baumgärtel goes too far. He finds an Appellative force sometimes where the evidence does not warrant any such conclusion. There is, however, only one class of cases, which we need discuss at any length, viz. his groups II and III. Our author points out that in certain books, especially the historical books, Judges to Kings, phrases with Elohim (man of God, altar of God, etc.) are used by writers who as a rule use Yahweh as the Divine Name, and he suggests that these phrases had been inherited from pre-Mosaic days, or picked up from non-Israelite peoples in Canaan, and that, being rooted in the popular mind and speech, they were used 'without prejudice' by the prophetic writers of history. If on the lips of Canaanites Elohim had a polytheistic sense, that sense had dropped away by the time that Samuel and Kings were written. The usage in the historical books is thus reason-

ably explained, but it does not follow that in these stereotyped phrases Elohim is therefore not equivalent to Yahweh. On the contrary, it seems reasonable to say that in using the popular phrases the writers did understand Elohim as equivalent to Yahweh. If in the phrase 'the angel of Yahweh' (17 times in the Pentateuch, 40 times outside) Yahweh is a proper name, there can be no reason why in the parallel phrase (5 times in Gen.–Ex., 7 times in Judges) Elohim should not also have been used by the writers as a proper name. But what does follow is this: that these phrases with Elohim, which lingered long in the popular speech and which were used by writers who otherwise always used Yahweh, cannot be appealed to as decisively indicating an Elohistic author. On the other hand, where they occur in an Elohistic context, it can be fairly said that they fit in with the view that the passage is by a writer of that kind.

Let us now apply these principles of Baumgärtel to the use of Elohim within the Pentateuch. The total uses, classified as far as possible under Baumgärtel's catagories, may be tabulated as on the following page.

The following general conclusions seem legitimate deductions from the results attained by means of this investigation.

1. The immense preponderance of proper-noun uses of Elohim in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15} over those in the remaining books of the Pentateuch retains all the significance which we have claimed for it in the article, and indeed acquires even greater significance. If we accept all possible deductions of Baumgärtel's lines, we find 145 proper-noun uses before Ex. 3^{16} to 22 after (i.e. $6\frac{2}{3}$ to 1) instead of 178 to 63 (i.e. a little under 3 to 1), more than twice the proportion!

2. We need not, however, go so far as that. The Table shows 73 possible appellative uses in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15} against 145 clearly proper-noun uses. Of these 73, 40 are unmis-

TABLE OF USES OF ELOHIM IN THE PENTATEUCH.

	Gen.–Ex. 3[15].	Ex. 3[16]–end.	Lev.	Num.	Deut.	Total.
A. Appellative on internal grounds.						
1. Unmistakable cases—						
i. Of the true God .	36	52	52	14	325	479
ii. Of other Gods . .	4	20	1	3	37	65
	40	72	53	17	362	544
2. Possible cases—						
i. On internal grounds:						
(*a*) The Deity generally * . . .	0	4	0	1	1	6
(*b*) In contrast to man†	6	0	0	0	3	9
(*c*) Supremely mighty‡	3	1	0	0	0	4
(*d*) In converse with non-Israelites §	15	7	0	2	0	24
(*e*) Equivalent to The Sanctuary ‖ .	0	4	0	0	0	4
ii. On external grounds: Expressions such as 'angel,' etc., of God, esp. if in a Yahwistic context¶	9	12	0	1	3	25
	33	28	0	4	7	72
Add A 1.	40	72	53	17	362	544
Total of A 1 and 2.	73	100	53	21	369	616
B. As Proper name, equivalent to Yahweh	145	16	0	6	0	167
Total occurrences of Elohim .	218	116	53	27	369	783

* (A 2 i (*a*) = Baumgärtel I. 2.) Under this heading are included such passages as Ex. 4[16], 'thou [Moses] shalt be to him [Aaron] as God,' and 7[1] 'I have made thee a God to Pharaoh.' Ex. 21[13] is an interesting example. Elohim might here be translated 'Providence.' If a man does not intentionally direct the blow, 'its direction must be attributed to the Superhuman Power.' Elohim is distinguished from the Divine Lawgiver, Who says: 'I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee.' See also Ex. 22[28], Nu. 21[5], Deut. 25[18].

† (A 2 i (*b*) = Baumgärtel I. 3.) In Gen. 6[2, 4] 'the sons of God' in contradistinction to 'the daughters of men' is no doubt a phrase taken from the ancient story, and Elohim is not here equivalent to Yahweh. In 9[16] Elohim, where we might have expected 'me,' is due to the con-

takably appellatives and have always been regarded as such. The 15 uses in converse with non-Israelites have not been appealed to by careful scholars as proofs of an Elohistic writer, but they are not therefore necessarily appellative. I do not think that in any of the 9 expressions in A 2 ii Elohim is really appellative, unless it be in Gen. 20^{11}, which might come under A 2 i (*a*), as it is spoken in

trast with 'every living creature' (the LXX, as we might expect, gives the easier reading). In Gen. 32^{28} the antithesis of God and man is marked and verse 30 must be read in conjunction with verse 24, 'a man.' Compare Hos. 12^{4}, where Jacob's antagonist is called 'the angel.' It is not Yahweh Himself. In Gen. 33^{10} the phrase 'as one seeth the face of God' is a similar use and is probably taken over from primitive usage in the popular speech. See also Deut. 1^{17}, 4^{32}, 5^{20}.

‡ (A 2 i (*c*) = Baumgärtel I. 5.) Gen. 23^{6} 'a mighty prince,' 30^{8} 'mighty wrestlings,' 35^{5} 'a great terror'; Ex. 9^{28} 'mighty thunderings.' See RV in all four passages.

§ (A 2 i (*d*) = Baumgärtel I. 7.) These are for the most part obvious, but it may be noted that in including Gen. 3^{5} I follow RV text 'as God' rather than RV marg. 'as gods.' The other passages are Gen. $3^{1, 3, 5}$, $21^{22, 23}$, 39^{9}, 40^{8}, 41 (7 times); Ex. 18 (7 times); Nu. 22^{38}, 23^{27}.

‖ (A 2 i (*e*) = Baumgärtel I. 8.) Ex. 21^{6}, $22^{8, 9, 9}$ RVt. 'God,' RVm. and AV 'the judges.' This latter rendering takes it that certain men, Levitical priests or judges, were called Elohim, as representatives of the Deity at the holy place or sanctuary, or as reflecting the divine majesty and glory. The former implies that people came to the sanctuary, because God dwelt there and spoke to them through His representatives. The practical meaning is the same in either case. Baumgärtel takes 'God' in these phrases as = the Sanctuary.

¶ (A 2 ii = Baumgärtel II.) Gen. 20^{11} the fear, 21^{17} and 31^{11} the angel, 28^{12} and 32^{1} and Ex. 14^{19} the angels, 28^{17} and ^{22} the house, 32^{2} the host; Ex. 3^{1} and 4^{27}, 18^{5}, 24^{13} the mount, 4^{20} and 17^{9} the rod, 8^{19} and 31^{18} and Deut. 9^{10} the finger, 31^{3} and 35^{31} and Nu. 24^{2} the spirit, 32^{16} the work, ^{16b} the writing, Deut. 21^{23} the curse, 33^{1} the man, of God. I have already discussed this type of expression in connexion with Baumgärtel's Group II. Probably the great majority, if not all, of them belong to my Group B, i.e. in the mind of the writer who uses these popular expressions, they meant exactly the same as if he had said: 'the angel, etc., of Yahweh.' In almost every case they appear in Elohistic contexts, where in any case we might expect Elohim to be used, but in e.g. 28^{12}, $^{17, 22}$ they appear in 'a Yahwistic' passage. (Yahweh *may* be the right reading in ver. 20. See Skinner's *Divine Names*, p. 42.) Gen. 1^{2} 'the Spirit of God' has not been included. Elohim here cannot be treated as having a more general meaning than in the other 34 occurrences in this passage. None of the 'phrases' referred to by Baumgärtel in his Group III occur in the Pentateuch.

reference to non-Israelites. That leaves only 9 (or 10) probable deductions from my original 178, viz. those grouped under A 2 i (*b*) and (*c*).

3. It is important to note that in Baumgärtel's opinion his investigation strengthens the evidence for the trustworthiness of the Massoretic text in regard to the use of the Divine names throughout the Old Testament, but this point will come up for discussion in Article 3, Part III, and a mere mention is enough here.

J. Battersby Harford.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON PRAYER.

Prayer is the most truly characteristic act of a religious man. It is the instinctive act of one who is aware of the personality and the nearness of God. There are great truths conditioning it, great problems connected with it, and great openings for progress in the art of it. Nevertheless, it does not in itself call for any use of books. "For praying," as William Law said, "is not speaking forth eloquently, but simply the true desire of the heart; and the heart, simple and plain in all good desires, is in the truest state of preparation for all the gifts and graces of God. And this I must tell you, the most simple souls that have accustomed themselves to speak their own desires and wants to God in such short but true breathings of their heart to Him, will soon know more of prayer and the mysteries of it, than any persons who have only their knowledge from learning and learned books." As Schleiermacher said in one of his sermons: "To be religious and to pray are one and the same thing." What Sabatier put negatively—"Where there is no prayer, there is no religion," Deissmann puts positively, "Religion, wherever it is alive in man, is prayer."

This instinctive and untutored act does, however, when the mind begins to reflect upon it, open up great problems, some religious, some scientific, some philosophical in their character, to the discussion of which many thoughtful men have given earnest attention: the experience of praying people has revealed a great variety of methods by which prayer may be cultivated, and of ends to which it may be directed: and the example of many generations of saints has accumulated a vast treasury of Christian prayers, in which those who come after may find stimulus and suggestion. Along each of these lines there has grown up a literature on the subject of prayer so great that it is an unusually difficult task to discuss it and to select from it the books that are "best."

Our selection will be made on the assumption that for the most part the needs and difficulties of Christian folk in our own generation will be best met by contemporary or nearly contemporary writers. It is true that much of what they have to say has been said in effect again and again before. But it is said now with modifications of emphasis and variations of penetration which make the recent work on the whole more fitted to the requirements of our time. We shall consider, therefore, chiefly the more recent books, and we shall classify them according as they deal with the theory of prayer, the practice and usefulness of prayer, and examples of prayer. The Liturgies and Directories of Worship must be passed over as forming a department of their own.

At the same time, the student will not be indifferent to the history of prayer, neither will he neglect the classics. A full and comprehensive history of prayer, even within the limits of the Bible and Christianity, still remains to be written; and few undertakings of the kind would be more worth while. The *terminus a quo* for such a history might

be found in Jeremiah, if Wellhausen be right in saying that Jeremiah is "the father of true prayer," on the ground that in him prophecy completes the transition to religion taken to signify the mystery of the union between man and God. For such a history much useful material has been collected by von der Goltz in his work entitled *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (1901). The Old Testament origins which he passes over may be studied in Hempel's *Gebet und Frömmigkeit im A. T.*, in the article by Hans Schmidt in *Religion der Geschichte und Gegeenwart*, II, col. 1150, or in Canon Bernard's article in Hastings's *Bible Dictionary*, IV, p. 32 ("with one exception—Deut. xxvi. 1–15—there is nothing about prayer in the Law"). In the work of von der Goltz there is a careful examination of our Lord's practice of prayer, and also of prayer addressed to Him within the New Testament. An article by the same writer on the general subject in *R.G.G.*, II, 1141, should not be forgotten, nor yet Dr. Israel Abrahams's "Some Rabbinic Ideas on Prayer" in his *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, II, 72 (1924).

Of special interest, though less historical and more analytical, is the work of the Swedish scholar, Friedrich Heiler, first published in 1918 and already in its fifth edition (1923). The section on the philosophical criticism of prayer is unexpectedly brief though penetrating. The main strength of the book will be found in the sections on Prayer as practised by great religious Personalities, and the distinction which is fully worked out between prayer in Mysticism and Prayer that is characteristic of "prophetic piety." The fifth edition is notable for the acknowledgment that the writer has seen cause to change his view about "mysticism." "Under the influence of Friedrich von Hügel, W. R. Inge and Mrs. Evelyn Underhill, the most unbiassed and most sympathetic investigators of

mysticism in the past and in the present, the writer has been led to correct at various points his earlier conception of, and judgment upon, mysticism, and to free himself entirely from the theory of mysticism held by Ritschl." The results of this important change of view have not yet been incorporated in the text, but are represented in the appendix, which gives abundant provision of notes and references. In English there are two recent books contributing to the history of prayer, one by Professor Emery Barnes, *Early Christians at Prayer*, the other by Mr. A. L. Lilley, *Prayer in Christian Theology*. Both these volumes are to be welcomed, though the scope of the latter is not so wide as its title might suggest: it confines itself almost entirely to prayer and the conception of it as represented among the mystical theologians.

Again, the student will not neglect the classical writings on the subject. Among these must be reckoned the treatises by several of the ancient Fathers, especially Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Origen. They, particularly the two former, deal largely with what may be called the circumstances and the adjuncts of prayer, but it is Tertullian who has given us the memorable phrase, "that noble and costly sacrifice of prayer," and Clement (in his portrait of the ideal Christian in the seventh book of the *Stromateis*) develops a conception of prayer which has had a wide influence on subsequent thinking. He defines prayer as "ascensio mentis ad Deum," and although he does not exclude definite petition from the scope of prayer the emphasis that he lays on knowledge of God's will as a condition of prevailing prayer introduces a note of hesitancy into such petitions. Origen shows himself familiar with perplexities such as present themselves to the modern mind, e.g. that prayer is vain if God foresees already what is to happen, or if all things happen according to a fixed Divine

decree, which it is presumption to believe that prayer can change. He shows himself concerned to maintain the propriety and the efficacy of direct petition even for material things. The distinction reappears throughout the succeeding centuries. Thought tends to emphasize either the contemplative or the active aspect of prayer, the former being specially represented in the mystical writers of the Middle Ages.

The effects of the Reformation in this field may be seen in the collection of prayers by Martin Luther, Bugenhagen and others, which was published in 1866, prayers which are simple, terse and full of believing confidence, in which he who prays does not reflect much upon himself, but makes his wants, spiritual and material, known to a merciful God. The classics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England include the *Preces Privatæ* of Bishop Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living*, and particularly the works of William Law. It should be unnecessary to commend his *Serious Call*, which is a classic of delightful wit as well as of Christian experience; but equally deserving of careful study, though less well known, is his *Spirit of Prayer* (1752). "Every breath therefore of the true spirit of prayer can be nothing else but the breath of the Spirit of God, breathing, inspiring, and moving, the heart in all the variety of its motions and affections towards God. And, therefore, every time a good desire stirs in the heart, a good prayer goes out of it that reaches God as being the fruit and work of His Holy Spirit."

Among modern books it can hardly be said that we have a thoroughly satisfactory monograph dealing with the whole subject of prayer. The intellectual problems to which it gives rise are referred to and treated more or less thoroughly in many of the books on the philosophy of religion or on Christian theology, or again in books which are mainly

concerned with the practice of prayer. But in either case they "come in from alongside" as the Apostle might have said. And the treatment is apt to be either too technical or too perfunctory to satisfy the serious student who is not deeply versed in philosophy. The best approach to the study is probably to be found in the article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, by Dr. d'Arcy (Archbishop of Armagh). In this the modern Christian explanation and defence of the practice of prayer is set forth with clearness and authority. The moral or theological objections and the scientific are dealt with in succession, and then a series of "minor objections." The scientific objection is met as by most modern theologians by a criticism of the conception of "natural law." The sharp distinction between the material and the spiritual realms cannot any longer be maintained. It is admitted that man has power to affect and to alter the inclinations and the purposes of his fellow-man. But he is able also to affect and alter the influences of Nature. He is able to use these natural forces, and combine them in a multitude of ways to serve his own ends. And all this is done in accordance with the "laws of nature." Its very possibility depends upon the existence of natural law. The "laws of nature" are only another name for the trustworthiness of natural forces. And it is absurd to suppose that this characteristic of natural law which gives man all his power over nature, creates an obstacle in the way of Divine activity. After dealing with the special difficulty felt in connection with intercessory prayer, the writer, in the closing section of his article, sets the whole subject in the light of a true conception of God as at the same time immanent and transcendent, the supreme personal Life within the sphere of whose being there is room for the free interaction of a whole multitude of finite persons. "The result of the whole investigation is this:

to a believer in a living God the efficacy of prayer is capable of ample justification. None of the objections that have been made against it on scientific or on philosophical grounds can be sustained."

A wider and fuller treatment of the subject will be found in the well-known volume entitled *Concerning Prayer* (edited Canon Streeter, 1916), to which several distinguished writers have contributed. Many of the topics discussed belong rather to the periphery of the subject than to its centre : and while there is a chapter on Prayer in the Old Testament, we miss any corresponding account of prayer in the New Testament or after. The chapters on " Petition, some Theoretical Difficulties " (by Mr. Edwyn Bevan), on " Intercession " (by Mr. Leonard Hodgson), and on " The World Order " (by Mr. A. C. Turner) deal with the heart of the problem, and indicate helpful lines for its solution. *The Christian Doctrine of Prayer*, a volume edited by the late Dr. Hastings (1915), combines the theoretical and the practical interests of the subject, and is perhaps for those who are not prepared to go deeply into the philosophy of the question, the most useful manual available. It is characterized by the large number of illustrative passages culled from many different writers and thinkers. A curious and interesting volume is that entitled *The Power of Prayer* (edited W. P. Paterson, 1920). It consists of a selection to the number of twenty from more than sixteen hundred essays upon Prayer sent in connection with a prize offered by the Walker Trust. The selection, while it includes the best, includes also other essays which have been printed " with a view to producing a volume which should throw light upon the life and thought of the whole religious world of to-day." It would be hard to find a volume in which more varied and opposed opinions were represented, but there is an underlying unity of conviction as to the importance

and reality of prayer which in the end becomes very impressive. Mention should be made of the excellent classified bibliography (by W. C. Fraser) which is printed at the end of this volume.

Our second class should include those books which are devoted to the exposition of prayer, its methods, its value and the possibilities which it opens up. In the choice to be made from a large number of excellent books it is inevitable that personal taste should play a considerable part. One would not like to forget one's gratitude to Marcus Dods for *The Prayer that teaches to Pray*, or to Bishop Gore for *Prayer and the Lord's Prayer*. Among more recent books we may distinguish a group in which the mystical element is dominant. Of such are Miss Swettenham's *Conquering Prayer* (1906) and *Creative Prayer* by the late Mrs. Herman (1921). The latter is remarkable for the sustained way in which prayer is exhibited as a creative agency transforming both the worshipper and his environment. "Any material amelioration or social reform which may be secured is a by-product of the central process; its excellence depends upon its connection with it." So it is with entirely practical aims on the far horizon that the book is devoted to an account of that central process whereby men rise to the Priesthood of Prayer. To some it may seem to present an ideal that is beyond the reach of plain men, but it is a book that should be studied.

A small volume which has commended itself, and that deservedly, to a very large number of people, is Dr. McNeile's *Self-training in Prayer* (first edition, 1916). Its very practical purpose is carried out in a very practical way, and yet with an earnestness and persuasiveness which make both the book and the subject attractive. A suitable companion to Dr. McNeile's work will be found in Dr. Fosdick's *The Meaning of Prayer* (first edition, 1915). This

is arranged for devotional reading from day to day, and owes its attractiveness to the skilful combination of Scripture text with comment and illustration and with prayers drawn from many sources. Mention should also be made of *A Book of Prayers for Students* recently published by the Student Christian Movement.

When we come to collections of prayers there is again a wide choice. And the choice will include two extremes. It would appear that written prayers to be helpful must either be such as have stood the test of time, or new minted out of the heat and pressure of contemporary life. Prayers, and still more collections of prayers, which can be described as modern, seldom have the quality of wearing. The more exactly they have fitted in with the mood and need of an hour that is passed, the less certain they are to fit without jarring into the mood or need of the present. We shall be wise therefore to seek for what is best among the classical examples and also for those provided by fine Christian minds which combine a keen sense of the needs, religious, moral and social of our own time with a clear understanding of the bearing upon them of the revealed mind and will of God. Among the English classics it is hard to pass over *The Devotions of Bishop Andrewes* (edited by Dr. Alex. Whyte, 1896, and by Dr. A. E. Burn, 1908). Scriptural and doctrinal in their basis, minute and, as it sometimes seems, almost mechanical in their analysis, these prayers may often fail to appeal to the modern mind. Yet there is about them as a whole a massiveness and a solemnity which are a valuable prophylactic against the superficiality and the jauntiness of many modern prayers.

These prayers are the work of one hand. Of prayers from many sources there are old collections which have still historical value. Of such are *Reformed Devotions*, edited by Wasse (Oxford, 1719), and *The Book of Private*

Devotion, edited by E. B. Bickersteth (1839). As a collection of the finest examples from the past, the product of many minds, there is nothing so good as that edited by Dr. Selina Fox, *A Chain of Prayer across the Ages* (1913). It is thoroughly catholic and comprehensive in its representation of the best in Christian prayer. Within it each one can form for himself his own canon of prayer as he forms his own canon of scripture. Of similar quality, though not so extensive, is the volume edited by M. W. Tileston, *Great Souls at Prayer*, a selection made with knowledge and good judgment. It is hardly necessary to mention *Prayers, written at Vailima*, by R. L. Stevenson (1905). They have commended themselves to many by the simplicity and directness with which they express the common needs and aspirations of a family group.

Finally, though our list is far from exhausted, there is a small collection of special value, recently published by Mr. Hoyland. Its title, *A Book of Prayers for Indian Colleges*, indicates its special purpose ; but the limitation is only an apparent one. Some may detect a certain preciousness in some of the prayers ; others may miss any specifically Christian reference. But the latter is easily and naturally supplied ; and of most of the prayers it may be said that along with deep sincerity they have a note of peculiar freshness and insight : many Christians will be thankful to make them their own. And others who may do the same will surely be led ere long to seek in the Gospel of Christ "the divine Force unto Salvation."

Confining ourselves therefore to books in English, and bearing in mind that in this connection especially the needs and tastes of different persons are very different, we may make our list as follows :—

"Prayer, Christian" : Dr. d'Arcy's article in *ERE*.

Concerning Prayer : edited by Canon Streeter.

The Christian Doctrine of Prayer : edited by Dr. Hastings.

A. H. McNeile : *Self-Training in Prayer.*
H. E. Fosdick : *The Meaning of Prayer.*
E. Herman : *Creative Prayer.*

Bp. Andrewes : *Private Prayers.*
S. Fox : *A Chain of Prayer across the Ages.*
M. W. Tileston : *Great Souls at Prayer.*
A Book of Prayers for Use in Indian Colleges.

C. Anderson Scott.

SYMBOLS AND SACRAMENTS; OR, WHAT PREVENTS INTERCOMMUNION?

There is to-day, at any rate in the Protestant Churches, a widespread desire for real brotherhood. Each denomination, anxious to be loyal to its inheritance, is at the same time readier than ever before to respect the loyalties of others. The line of cleavage between them is so often quite evidently not that of any fundamental *religious* difference. Anglicans and Free-Churchmen of various kinds gladly pray together and worship together on occasion, and unite whole-heartedly in all sorts of religious work. Why is it that in the act which is to nearly all of them central in their religious life, the most important expression of their union with their common Lord and with one another, they are still obliged, with perplexity, with sorrow, and with something of shame, to keep apart? What virus is there in philosophical and theological theory that turns the sign of deepest union into the occasion of apparently irreconcilable disunion?

The perplexity suggests an inquiry into the meaning of Sacrament and the function of Symbol generally, in the hope that it may throw light on this question of the Holy Communion and Intercommunion.

The special "Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death" [1] differs, it would seem, in value and importance, but not in essence as sacrament, from other experiences in which spiritual realities are realized and communicated by bodily material means. The world of material things, whatever other functions it may have, does act as stimulus to the spirit's activities, as the medium of its self-realization and as the vehicle of its self-expression.[2] And though in some other life, in other worlds, spirit may be able to realize and communicate itself without this bodily material medium, here, in this life, it seems, by the good ordinance of God, we can only realize spiritual realities, the greatest and the least alike, when we see them embodied and strive to embody them ourselves, and only by these same means can we communicate to others what we have realized. Our human love is only realized when it is lived out, expressed in deed and word. Even God's love had to take shape in flesh and blood before we men could realize it at all fully, and even then we also have to put it into flesh and blood again before we really understand it and communicate it to others. This is our Sacramental Principle.

Some would use the term "Sacrament" to cover every spiritual activity which manifests itself in the material world, any "coming down" of spirit into the material. The universe is a sacrament; man is a sacrament. And this general use can be justified. But then it would have to include evil spiritual communication as well as good, the curse and the blow as well as the kiss and other forms of love's self-giving. So here we will use the neutral term "Symbol" for the wider general sense, keeping "Sacrament" for the more restricted sense, applied to things

[1] The 28th Article of Religion in the Book of Common Prayer.
[2] Father Bull's *Sacramental Principle.*

specially sacred. All sacraments, whatever else they may be, are at any rate symbols.

A symbol, then, is something in the material or physical sphere which expresses or suggests to one spirit the thought, feeling or will of another. It may be a thing, e.g., a written word, a national flag, a cross, the sacramental bread and wine; or an act, e.g., the glance of an eye, a spoken word, a kiss, a blow, the Communion Service in any church. The world is a symbol. "The invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity." [1] So is man's body. So was Christ's body and all He did. However complete their divine reality they are symbols, most sacred symbols of the most sacred and concrete spiritual reality.

Now there are a few things worth noticing about all symbols as such which may help us.

(1) Symbols are in our common human experience necessary, because spirit is essentially social and self-communicative. Not only is every man dependent for his spiritual growth upon what parents, teachers, writers and others impart to him. Unless he imparts, expresses himself, he cannot as a spiritual being continue to live. If he is cut off from the ordinary means of communication by loss of sight, hearing, and speech, unless human ingenuity quickened by love can find a way round by other avenues, as in the case of deaf mutes, the natural result is idiocy. Spiritual faculty which does not express itself somehow can only languish and die. The expression may be in deed rather than in word. To say "Lord, Lord," may mean nothing, and worse. But in the normal life deed and word go together. It is well to do the one, and not to leave the other undone.

[1] Romans i. 20.

Incidentally, if we have a good thing, a spiritual good thing, some truth or knowledge, entrusted to us, and we don't express or communicate it we defraud others of what is their right. But the point here is that for the life of the spirit expression and communication are necessary. Feeling unexpressed languishes. Thought unexpressed remains vague, unshaped, unrealized, so far impotent. Knowledge uncommunicated may become mere lumber of memory, dying and useless, and soon cease to be knowledge, for knowledge is active exercise of the spirit knowing. And will unexpressed in word or deed is an unreality, if not a contradiction in terms.

Symbol therefore is necessary to spiritual life as we know it, for expression, communication, involves symbol.

(2) There is nothing unworthy of spirit in this necessity of using symbols. Spirit is not degraded by being immersed in matter. The Christian at any rate has no justification for the old complaint against the body and its material conditions as such. Jesus once and for all showed the human body to be a fit and adequate medium for realization and expression of the divine Spirit in its fullness of grace and truth. We may feel impatient when " Brother Body " seems to lag behind and impede the eager spirit's freedom of movement. But the weakness is in the spirit rather than in the body and its limitations. These are not fastened on us by some evil will, but by the good will of God. They are the appointed means of realizing and expressing His gracious will for us.

Our religion, then, is not weakened or made less pure because we must use symbols. We all do. The question for us is not whether we shall use symbols, but what symbols, and what use we shall make of them. Take an extreme example. The evil of idolatry is not the representation in visible and tangible symbolic form of the god men wor-

ship, so much as the worship of the symbol rather than of the spiritual reality symbolized. This is no small danger. But there is a greater. Men may, with or without visible and tangible symbolic representation, worship a spiritual being unworthy and debased, unholy, unlovely, and unloving, and may grow like the object of their worship. It is not the use of symbols as such that debases, but the giving of one's affection and worship to what is spiritually base. Some people, e.g., the Quakers, in protest against a natural tendency to idolatry of the form, feel it right to reduce the symbolic element in their worship to the lowest dimensions. They use no water for Baptism, either by sprinkling or immersion, no Bread and Wine for their spiritual communion with God and with one another. But symbolism there is even with them. The gathering in special places at special times for special spiritual exercises, the attitude, the speech or silence, the reading as aid to recollection of the words and acts of Jesus and of his apostles, are forms that may or may not be filled with spiritual reality. Who can say that the spiritual effect of their religious exercises, with this minimizing of the symbolic element, is greater, or less, than that of the more elaborate symbolic ritual of the Anglican or Roman or Eastern Orthodox Churchmen, so far as observation and experience can test ? Differences of effect there will be among them, as there are differences in every worshipping congregation, but these are due to differences not in the symbols of worship but in the sincerity of spirit in the persons using the symbols. If it were possible to worship without symbols, the worship would not therefore of necessity be purer or truer on the side of the worshipper ; is there any reason to suppose it would ensure more effective communication of truth and grace on the part of the object of worship ? These things depend on the nature of the

Spirit worshipped and the relation between Him and the worshipping spirit. That is to say, given as constant the Holy God and his desire to communicate of His spirit, His grace, the measure of the actual communication will surely be the receptiveness, the responsiveness, i.e. the faith, of the worshipping human spirit brought into communion rather than the material medium of communion, which in any one service is alike for all, for the little faith, the great faith, and the no faith, even for the hard-hearted and for the hypocrite.

(3) For, though symbolism is necessary to spirit and not in itself unworthy of spirit, the whole value of a symbol is in the spiritual reality it symbolizes and not in the symbol itself as such. Some symbols may be more naturally apt to convey a special message from one spirit to another, some may be more beautiful, some more elaborately expressive. A gold ring and an elaborate wedding are in some societies felt to be fit and proper symbols of wedded love, and in such societies anyone whose love is strong will probably take care that these symbols shall be most perfect after their kind and play their part in the stimulation, realization, and expression of the affection. But the reality is something apart from the particular form of expression, and the purity and strength of it does not depend on the aptness or the elaborateness and expressiveness any more than it does upon the cost of the symbols. We naturally like the best, but the effectiveness of a symbol depends more on the sympathetic understanding of the spirits between whom the symbol is a means of communication than on the nature of the symbol. Whatever does the work and actually serves as the medium of communication is thereby proved effective and valid as a symbol, however simple, however homely. With imagination an old rag doll will stimulate, bring to realization

and expression, a child's maternal instinct as the most costly and realistic effigy may fail to do. Perhaps we have all known times when a religious service with the barest symbolic accessories has helped to an uplift of the heart that the more elaborate ritual has at other times failed to bring. The difference seems to be in the receptive and responsive spirit rather than in the symbols used. However complete and charged with possible meaning, the symbols may not mean much to us if our spiritual eyes and ears are for any reason closed and the will sluggish or contrary. The alert spirit is wakened by the faultiest symbols to love and devotion.

(4) For in the nature of things the symbol need not, generally cannot, correspond fully with the reality for which it stands. It is often useful just because it is a shorthand sign. A few words and gestures can give a whole story and its significance. All past history and present knowledge get embodied in literature and monuments. Only so can we reflect on memories, pick up rapidly and pass on to others the accumulated experiences of other minds and other generations. The very virtue of symbols is not in their completeness but in their suggestiveness. A picture, an action in miniature, a word, a tone of voice, three or four notes of music, a sudden scent of lavender, the glint of a ring, the outline of a cross, may even at chance moments bring vividly back whole worlds of memory and of thought, may possibly start a whole new life of will and purpose. How much these chance flashes will mean to a man depends, just as the result of more deliberate communication depends for him, largely on his own temper and the organization and the attitude of his mind. We cannot think of the spirit of God as less ready and able than a man's spirit to use any and every medium to waken attention, reflection, aspiration and

desire, and then to convey and communicate His blessing to the receptive faithful soul. This is not only what might be expected but what does happen.

(5) It is also of no small importance that this use of symbols, as suggesting spiritual reality to the mind, does leave the spirit to whom the symbol appeals free to respond or to ignore and reject the suggestion. There is nothing mechanical about spiritual communion, the communication of feeling, thought, and will. Be the symbols as such never so perfect, the communication of spiritual good, the imparting of the high quality of the one spirit to the other which lacks it, may be frustrated by heedlessness or unwillingness just where the need is greatest. After all, "thought is free." In things of the spirit we can only suggest, we cannot force. The child, by inattention or by deliberate refusal, may render useless the best planned lesson, or in wantonness of will may turn to ridicule the sincerest affection. Love's highest activity in passion on the Cross suggests and appeals, it cannot force love. The most moving symbol of love and communion may be made the occasion of disunion. God Himself, it appears, so values the willing response that he does violence to none. He will wait and forbear, will suffer and even allow others to suffer, for the ends of love, for willing reception and return of love, for the sake of winning the way for love in the hearts of men. True love is humble, its task to offer and wait, not force the will. Hence symbol is its proper language and instrument. By some sign or token the love in one heart wakens answering love in another fit soul, and by symbols the two hold communion. Thus symbol fulfils its highest function, stirring the human mind to the realization of the greatest of all spiritual realities, calling out that loyalty of faith and response of love which constitutes the most personal and most satisfying com-

munion of spirit. But it acts after all by suggestion, and the suggestion does not necessarily or always work. It may be ignored, misunderstood, even rejected. Its appeal is to the free spirit of man.

(6) This characteristic of symbol, as a medium of suggestion, of free communication and appeal from spirit to spirit, makes it specially appropriate as a *means of grace.*

"Grace" is used in many senses. It may stand for external beauty of a thing, of a body or bodily movement, —with that we are not directly concerned here. What we are concerned with is the spiritual beauty of a gracious act and of a character manifesting itself in such acts. Above all for our present purpose we think of the spirit, the mind, will, and purpose of holy, redeeming love in Jesus Christ our Lord, full of truth and grace. It is of his fullness that the early disciples received and we would receive. It is the spirit of holy love in which he carried through his work in the world, working, mixing with men, teaching them, healing them, dying on the Cross, ever and in all he did and said manifesting the redeeming love of God that was in him, and so becoming our Saviour.

Now this grace, surely, is not some impersonal spiritual force or influence, external to the personality of the recipient, which can by any medium or means, material or otherwise, be conveyed from one person to another apart from the recipient's own mind or will. It is in the giver a personal quality, a quality of his spirit, which can only be conveyed to or conferred upon another when his spirit, that is, his mind and will, his personality, takes on something of that same personal quality. If it was the supreme activity of this quality of spirit in our Lord, manifested in his earthly life and death, that made him our Saviour, victorious over sin and death, and drawing men to himself, then his church can only carry on his work, act as his body

in the world, so far as its members severally and corporately embody and express in word and deed that same quality of spirit. What need is ours of whatever means of grace he gives!

Can we understand at all how it works? How can we receive of his grace? how show in our activities of spirit something of the quality of spirit which was his in its fullness? That is the mystery of personality in God and His relations with man. But it is a mystery in human relationships too. They may help us.

All grace, even the more external, gives pleasure to the perceiving and appreciative mind and tends to quicken its vital powers. More, it wakens desire and stirs the will: the desire to enjoy and possess, where enjoyment and possession are possible, and the will to reproduce by imitation and loyal following, in the case of personal activities and qualities, where the grace, in work of art or in moral act and character, is capable of imitation and reproduction. Grace is ever a challenge to mind and heart and will to do as well. Indeed it becomes the Categorical Imperative on which all morality depends and to which all experience seems to point, which may be put shortly, "If you see a good thing to do, do it: if you have a good thing, share it," or you will be disloyal to God and to your neighbour, as well as to your best self. "We needs must love the highest when we see it," and "Our utmost for the highest" also put the universal law of spirit. And there is no legalism about this law—no antithesis between law and grace, for both are complementary parts of the same will of holy love. Grace at its tenderest is law at its highest and most inexorable. There is nothing in the world so strong to do and to endure as this gracious love, nothing so absolute in its demands, nothing so powerful to call out the same quality in others. And so grace becomes not only the

imperative but the greatest enabling power, making weak human nature strong for all high tasks.

So it shows itself in our human experience. How does the wise parent or teacher proceed? He does what he can by wise arrangement of environment, material and spiritual, especially in the child's early years, to encourage good habits of mind and body and discourage bad: first independently of the child's will, even in direct contradiction to some natural childish tendencies. But ever will he enlist the child's affections, intelligence, and good will, with more and more of freedom and self-determination and appeal to the sense of right; until in time the child grown up takes on in turn responsibility for the training of others. And so the real business of the world gets carried on, and each generation gets its training, its "chance of the prize of learning love." Alas! we know the chance may not be taken. Men's best efforts may fail, love may be misunderstood, rejected. Even the love of God and the grace of Christ may be ignored. But where love comes to its own and meets answering love there is the supreme blessedness which makes all the pains worth while,—the unity of will in high purpose, the communication of that very quality of gracious love.

And this can only be shown in this material world of flesh and blood in symbol, by act symbolic of the spiritual quality. And we are apt to find all symbol inadequate. Our best aspirations and most uplifting visions we cannot express even in word, much less in life. But if what has been noticed about symbols is true the inadequacy is not in the symbol but in the spirit, the human spirit using, or the human spirit interpreting, the symbol. Only God could speak the perfect, adequate word, in Christ, and only God can adequately interpret the imperfect attempted response of men. But God did speak the perfect word,

and does understand our inadequate response. That is the governing conception in our thought about the Service of Holy Communion.

For our Communion Service is the symbol of a symbol. The original symbol was God's great act in history, the life and death of Jesus, showing God's holy eternal love in action in the world, our Lord giving Himself without stint or reserve to redeem men from sin and make them one with God in heart and mind. This symbol was adequate, however inadequate our grasp of the reality it embodied. It is not repeated. That is not God's way. But the eternal spiritual fact which gave it its significance abides, and God is ever seeking men's love. And as we are always apt to flag and forget, we need reminders, to quicken and feed our feeble love and loyalty. And Jesus, knowing this well, himself instituted and explained a simple symbolic act which we repeat from time to time in remembrance of him. And this symbol, like all other symbols, seems to do its work when it brings the human spirit by suggestion, by remembrance, into consciousness of that historic act, and by that remembrance the spirit is quickened to humble thankfulness and receptiveness, penitence and aspiration, and loyal response of loving will to loving will.

But it would seem that, given the unchanging act of God in history and the eternal energy of holy love seeking in everything to communicate itself to man, the details of the symbolic act whereby the spirit renews its consciousness of it all are comparatively unimportant. Any and every symbol we can use will necessarily fall short of the thing symbolized—that is the nature of our symbols—but it can suggest to fit minds the whole. Use and wont may generally determine what will carry the spirit into its attitude of active receptivity. Some are helped in one way, some in another. The essence remains the same for

all, independent not perhaps of symbol but of any one particular form of symbol.

And so the Quaker makes his communion by mainly silent remembrance, and his soul is fed, as is the Catholic's, with his elaborate dramatic ritual. And it would seem that the only thing that need prevent Christians of different denominations making their communion together, on occasion, in most cordial union with each other, is when one or the other has a theory that only one way is right, only one set of symbols effectual, especially when the claim includes not only the acts of any one Communion Service but the whole succession of acts, physical and spiritual, from the first institution of the rite until now. If we allow any truth in the account of symbol given above we shall probably feel less and less need or desire to make any such exclusive claim. Most unhappy, surely, must be the Christian who makes such claim and feels it is proved, who honestly believes that all his Christian brethren who, by reason of difference of physical and spiritual descent and history, are outside the visible bounds of his communion are also outside the bounds of communion with God in Christ.

This is no plea for a merely latitudinarian tolerance which cares for none of these things, but an attempt to see things in due order and proportion. First the spiritual reality, of which the world and its history, including the Gospel history, is an expression ; then the means, all more or less partial and inadequate, which we use to call up to our own minds and others' what of the spiritual reality we have learned, so that we may come into contact with that personal spirit, its thought and purpose, its holy energy of love, which is the very life and health of our spirit. In proportion as the imagination is vivid and the attention under control of the will man's spirit may almost at will withdraw from the distracting suggestions of the

sensible world and concentrate its powers of remembrance and reception upon the presence from which he is never far off, may hear again the voice which has called him so often, and listening may receive the grace he needs.

The writer would not for anything belittle the solemn occasion, the preparatory ritual, the uplift of assemblies of like-minded aspirants, all reverent appeals to the senses of sight and hearing, of articulate speech or music, but would in all sincerity and earnestness urge that the spirit is not dependent, for its communion with the spirit of God, on all or any one of these. Christians may have, nay, by all the tests that human experience can apply, do have the substance without as well as with them. Cannot we stand fast ourselves, and allow others to stand fast, in the liberty with which Christ set us all free ?

There is one ground, and, so far as the present writer can see, one ground only, on which Christians might well shut themselves off from other Christians in this supreme act of worship. If we really thought that Jesus did actually ordain one fixed and unalterable order of symbolic action and made it an essential condition of communion with his spirit that this order should be followed without variation, then we might feel it was a test of obedience to follow this order and should hardly be able with good conscience to join with others who took liberties with the order. But the case is no sooner stated than it refutes itself. Whatever he meant by the symbols of the Supper in the Upper Room, whatever he meant by eating his flesh and drinking his blood—and he obviously meant much—to interpret it in this rigid exclusive way is surely to contradict one of the principles on which he commonly acted. His teaching was so much of it a protest against this very tendency to harden a good custom into a rigid law, and let it confuse the moral judgment and divide those who

ought to be one, that it is difficult to imagine such a view seriously held. There were times when the letter of Scripture was held to settle and fix for all time questions of scientific fact and history, and Churches have divided on some minute points such as the historical interpretation of a word, e.g., Episcopus, as it occurs in various documents of the New Testament and other Early Church literature. Happily this sort of division on the lines of old controversies is becoming increasingly unreasonable and intolerable. We are coming to see that each may, without detriment to spiritual union of a very real and effective kind, himself follow, and frankly allow others to follow, the line of approach to spiritual communion with God which each finds most helpful. If this investigation into the nature and function of symbol can help any to this freedom for himself and willingness to allow freedom to others it will have served its purpose.

E. W. JOHNSON.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

CHRISTIANITY has always been a religion for the multitude. Its Founder was one whom the common people heard gladly, who used simple words and images drawn from everyday life. Children and the unlearned can still read the four authoritative records of His doings with pleasure and profit.

The Gospel of John—we may call so it without making any assumption as to its author's identity—was written, like its three predecessors, to meet a popular need. As soon as the religion of Christ pressed its claim to be world-wide, it was confronted by the questions which have given rise to philosophy, and was compelled to place the brief life of Jesus of Nazareth against the immense background of preceding

time, to view this life, not as a bright patch in the discoloured web of history, but as the outcome of a long preparation, the rising up to the surface of a perennial stream.

The Evangelist accordingly begins by bringing before us the wayward race of man as the object of God's unceasing love and care, but unconscious or heedless of His purposes, following its own way without regard to Him. He does not write for students or philosophers, but for ordinary Gentile readers who desired to see the life of Jesus in its historical perspective and to understand its place in universal history. The earthly ministry of Jesus is thus presented at the outset as the climax of an eternal process. The light which had all along been warring with the darkness at length concentrates itself in a human life, and shines in an historical personage.

So we are prepared for the extraordinary narrative which follows. We are asked, in it to contemplate the doings of One who was at once man, and more than man, who suffered thirst, weariness, grief, as all men do, who carried His own humiliating cross to the place of crucifixion, and there gave up His spirit, and whose earthly ministry was yet a revelation of that Wisdom by which all things had been made, an effulgence of the Light which from the beginning had been shining within the hearts of men.

The double task thus laid upon John he had to accomplish not by argument or reasoned proof, but by a narrative which might take its place in the Church's usage as a Gospel charged with devotional power. The two threads, so indicated, are throughout visible. On the one hand we are struck by the marked circumstantiality of the narrative. The author seems to fear that we shall lose our hold of the historical fact in our preoccupation with the deep things which the fact symbolizes. He accordingly often stops on his way to give us geographical or historical details, which

to us may appear superfluous or disturbing. He tells us of the six waterpots at the wedding in Cana (ii. 6), of the five porches at the pool of Bethesda (v. 2), of the additional boats which came near the place where the thousands had been fed (vi. 23). He relates with much circumstantiality the request of the Greeks to be allowed to see Jesus (xii. 21), telling us the names of the three apostles who conveyed the request and the parts they severally played. He emphasizes the fact that Jesus bore His own cross (xix. 17). He appeals with much earnestness to the eye-witness who saw the water and the blood (xix. 35), and lest we should think "the disciple whom Jesus loved" to be an ideal figure, he is careful to mark the precise position of this disciple at the last supper, telling us that he had to lean back in order to question the Master (xiii. 25).

These are only a few of the circumstantialities in a Gospel where the work of Jesus is disengaged from its local and temporary accompaniments, and presented in the form of eternal truth. It is not wonderful that these characteristics should have given rise to suppositions which, plausible though they may be made to appear by skilful advocates, have not found any general or permanent acceptance. The entire Gospel has been represented as a deliberate allegory such as the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or the *Faery Queen*. The most thorough-going defender of this opinion is M. Loisy, for whom each incident, from the call of the disciples to the race of Peter and John to the sepulchre, has an occult meaning. Such a supposition repeatedly outrages the reader's sense of probability, and fails to explain why the writer should have so effectually disguised his object.

The two closely-woven threads have also been accounted for by the familiar hypothesis of a double authorship. A deep-thinking religious genius has been supposed to have adapted to his purposes a pedestrian historical narrative,

the composition of some previous hand. Before we begin, however, to look for two authors in a book, we should be satisfied that one is not enough. And the book before us seems explicable without such a supposition. A writer such as the book, taken at its face value, requires as its author, does not seem a psychological impossibility.

We picture a Christian disciple whose home was in the Ephesian district of Asia, and who found the chief interest of his life in thought rather than in action. He has deep spiritual insight, and has been in the habit of thinking about the ultimate problems. We must suppose him acquainted with the religious philosophy—the outcome of Greek thought upon the Old Testament—which had its home in Alexandria, but which found many eager students elsewhere among the Jews of the Dispersion. We must conceive him as one who drew no sharp distinction between the material and the spiritual world, for whom the two worlds were one, so that every historical fact must have its spiritual equivalent, and every spiritual truth its corresponding visible sign. That there have been and are such men is, I believe, unquestionable. They have powers and limitations which separate them, to their gain and loss, from ordinary mankind. We must suppose such a man to have been moved to write a Gospel which should be intelligible to ordinary Gentile readers, while yet it presented the work of Jesus in its universal form. On the one hand he must do full justice to the reality of the life he was recording, showing that it had been actually lived, while on the other he presented it as the symbol of eternal truth. Spirit and flesh while he wrote pressed their conflicting claims, and each strove to displace the other. The result is the strange union of matter-of-factness and spiritual elevation which makes this book unique. The Gospel further suggests that the writer accepted the entire Christian tradition, that he was a loyal

son of the Church of his day, setting a high value upon its ministries, and anxious to protect its sacraments from misuse.

His literary workmanship is most obvious in the two miracles, or "signs," as he calls them, of the healing of the man born blind (chap. ix.), and the raising of Lazarus (chap. xi.).

We must suppose the life-like dialogue in chapter ix. to have been built up by our evangelist upon some incident in the Galilean ministry which he accepted without doubt or question as authentic history and then proceeded to make the vehicle of supersensual truth. He boldly transfers this Galilean incident to Jerusalem that he may show us, in their own holy city, the really blind, those who closed their eyes to facts from which, do what they might, they could not escape. What the opponents of the Gospel found the greatest difficulty in explaining was plainly the Christian consciousness of having passed from death to life, from sleep to waking (cp. e.g. Eph. v. 14). This we know was the strongest weapon in the Church's armoury. The disciples could appeal with irresistible force to the health they now possessed and to which before they had been strangers. In the blind man we must see the multitudes who could not account for what the new faith had done for them, but who knew what it had done. It was useless to tell them that they were the victims of an illusion, or that their healer, being what He was, could not possibly have effected such a cure. Their experience remains unshaken, and the question rises at the end: Who are the really blind? Is it those who trust their experience, or those who try to escape from it, and commit the unpardonable sin by closing their eyes to indubitable facts.

The raising of Lazarus (chap. xi.), like the transformation of the water at Cana, has no historical support in the

synoptic records. We know of it only what is here related. Again we are struck by the circumstantiality of the narrative. Great care is taken to make it clear that Lazarus had suffered physical death. Lest the disciples should think that his sleep was not that of death, Jesus says to them plainly : " Lazarus is dead." He has lain four days in the tomb before the Saviour reaches the neighbourhood of Bethany. The distance of this village from Jerusalem is carefully marked. In spite of this distance the Jews of the city have heard of the death. The dead man comes forth from the tomb bound hand and foot with grave clothes. His face is covered with a napkin. Realism can hardly go further.

On the other hand, the spiritual truth, to which the matter-of-fact narrative points, is set forth with unmistakable emphasis in the declaration that those who believe on Jesus do never taste the separation from God which makes the sting of death (xi. 26). Death in this sense Lazarus had not tasted and would never taste. No hint is given that he was the gainer by what had happened or that he would have been the loser had his body been left in the tomb. In either case he has already the life eternal, and more he cannot have.

Such being the literary method of our writer, we now proceed to look at the philosophical ideas of which he makes striking use. These lead us back to the great thinker to whom primitive Christianity owes its greatest debt. The thoughts of Plato, which had been moving within the minds of men for some four centuries before the Christian era, reached our evangelist through the philosophy we know as Alexandrianism. In the great city at the mouth of the Nile the intellect of ancient Greek came for the first time in contact with the religious earnestness which created the Old Testament. The meeting of these two tendencies—

the one intellectual, the other religious—led to an adaptation by Christian thinkers of Platonic thought to the Church's teachings.

Plato was the first of Pagan philosophers to find the key to the riddle of life, not in material, but in spiritual happenings. The solution for him is to be sought in what man does and suffers as a spiritual being, a being who reaches forward beyond what he knows or can firmly grasp.

The structure by which this great thinker endeavoured to secure his idealism was only a first attempt to do justice to the spiritual side of human nature, and is now valuable rather by reason of its presuppositions than by what it actually achieves. For him there were two worlds, one supersensual, real, and without any relation to time, the other the world of sense, with which we have to do in our everyday conduct, and which is in continual flux, ever *becoming* and consequently never *being*. The soul has relation to both worlds. Its original home is the eternal world, from which it fell—how or why the philosopher does not consistently explain—and to which, when purged of its fleshly defilements, it will return. Meantime it is imprisoned within the body, dimly remembering its original existence, and yearning unconsciously after the home it has lost.

This solution of the riddle of life may be found lying beneath the narrative of John. For him also there is a heavenly world of which the occurrences in time are reflections or symbols. In this "upper" world Jesus uninterruptedly dwells. He is already in the "heaven" to which His disciples will shortly see Him ascend (iii. 13). In it are the realities to which the good things of the earth point, the living bread (vi. 51), the inexhaustible water (iv. 14), the true vine (xv. 1), the undying life (xvii. 2). To Jesus this heavenly world is as an open vision, or a harmony ever

audible, and as He sees so He works (v. 19), as He hears so He speaks and judges (v. 30, viii. 26). Thus His prayers are not contingent requests. They are utterances of what He knows, which He sometimes allows others to overhear (xi. 42).

In this world His life receives its direction. His course is not shaped on earth. Neither the entreaties of His friends (vii. 3), nor the machinations of His enemies (xii.8), influence Him. When the appointed hour has struck in the eternal world, He acts, but not till then. His life cannot end until the twelve appointed hours have passed (xi. 9). His judge has no power against Him except such as has been given him from above (xix. 11). Seeing thus what no one but He sees, He walks in fearless security. No man takes His life from Him. He lays it down of Himself (x. 18).

The eternal life of this higher world takes here the place of that Messianic Kingdom whose speedy coming was the hope of the infant Church. To those who share with Jesus His heavenly life, who are "where He is," the Kingdom has already come. It has ceased to be a material entity, and has become a spiritual experience. The return of Jesus, and all that it implies, has already taken place for those who love Him and keep His sayings (xiv. 23). They already occupy the place He has prepared for them in that spiritual house where He and they alike dwell (xiv. 2, 3). The break in their intercourse caused by His death is brief and negligible. It is expedient for them that He goes away. Hardly has He left them till He returns in greater power. The Resurrection day has not passed till they receive the Spirit which has been previously identified with Jesus Himself (cp. xiv. 18 with xx. 21), and the promised and indissoluble union with Him has been effected.

The contrast between the two worlds forms the often-noticed irony of the Gospel. What is *here* insignificant

may be *there* of great moment. The humble procession of Palm Sunday is the entrance of the King of Israel upon his world-wide dominion (xii. 19). The disciples perceive afterwards the glory to which at the moment they have been blind (xii. 16). Jesus reigns upon the Cross upon which He appears to be hanging helpless. He is lifted up that He may draw all men unto Him (xiii. 32). Caiaphas prophesies without knowing that he does (xi. 50). His words have one meaning below, and another in the higher world. So Jesus and His adversaries are repeatedly at cross purposes, because their thoughts and His move on different planes. They put a child's meaning upon such expressions as "finding Jesus," "coming down from heaven," "eating the flesh of the Son of Man." The proper meaning of such phrases belongs to a world to which they have not access. Interpreted in their fashion they become meaningless.

The more deeply this extraordinary book is studied, the more amazed we must be at the speediness and the universality of its reception. Its most important implications cannot have been at first perceived. Indeed they are hardly perceived yet. The work of Christ is here recognized as being in progress before the Incarnation (i. 4), and as extending far beyond the company of His avowed followers (x. 16). The verdicts of the human reason and conscience when guided by the Spirit of truth are identified with His decisions (xvi. 13). The subsequent works of His followers are pronounced to be greater than His own during His earthly ministry (xiv. 12). Inward experience is put above historical occurrences as a ground of belief in the great saying: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." It is hardly rash to say that if all external authority were to fail, if the synoptic records were to become more disputable than they are, the Church's worship less attractive, its Sacraments less valued, this

Gospel would still keep alive a real Christianity, teaching men how they might unite themselves with Jesus and in Him overcome the world.

J. Gamble.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

THE APOCALYPTIC DISCOURSE IN S. LUKE XVII.

It is thought by some that this little piece of apocalyptic is an interpolation, and forms no part of our Lord's utterance on this occasion; and others would add, "nor on any other." It is pointed out that Luke xvii. 23–4 and Matthew xxiv. 23, 27, also Luke xvii. 26–7 and Matthew xxiv. 37–9, and also Luke xvii. 35–7, and Matthew xxiv. 37, 40, 41, are almost verbally identical. Hence (in part) the view of the passage under consideration being an interpolation. It may be replied that Jesus may have spoken in this strain more than once. Possibly. But this is merely begging the question. The exegesis given below is an attempt to show that there is a close and real connexion between the apocalyptic utterance and the reply which Jesus gave to the Pharisees.

We must, first, remember that, in part, the question is a chronological one: that Luke, in his preface, professes to have had at least some regard to chronology, which appears to be true in several cases other than this: also that Matthew undoubtedly lumps together divers discourses of our Lord in his (Matthew's) "sermon on the mount": that he also lumps the parables of the kingdom together: and that, therefore, Matthew may very possibly have lumped together certain apocalyptic sayings of Jesus. Hence, if we can show a real connexion between this apocalyptic utterance and the reply to the Pharisees, we may show, not only that Luke is probably right chronologically in this instance (as he also is with certain sections of the "sermon on the mount") but also that it is probably not an interpolation.

The Pharisees are reported as coming to our Lord and asking Him when the Kingdom of God would come. Jesus gave them the well-known reply, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with

observation ; neither shall they say, Lo here ! or, There ! for lo, the Kingdom of God is within you "—or, " among you " : that is, there would be nothing to see in connexion with the coming of the Kingdom, such that anyone could say, " It is here," or, " There " : it would not come in such a manner as to be noticeable either in point of time or locality, as they imagined : it would not be ushered in melodramatically to the world—for the Kingdom of Heaven was already in their midst.

Nothing more, at the moment, seems to have been said to the Pharisees. But later, probably at the request of the disciples, Jesus returns to the subject. Both these suppositions are quite in accordance with precedent, and extremely probable in this instance. Jesus begins by saying, " The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it " : that is, the time was coming when they would desire to see one of the days (a coming) of the Son of man, but, a melodramatic coming, such as they looked for, they would not see. " And they shall say unto you, Lo there ! Lo here ! go not away, nor follow them " : that is, there *would* be days when some one would say " I am he," and " the period of the kingdom has now come." They were not to be misled. Jesus goes on, " For as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven ; so shall the Son of man be in his day " : that is, He and His Kingdom were a light to enlighten the whole world. " But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation." This proved true. While this enlightenment of the world was proceeding, things would go on in just the ordinary way. " As it was in the days of Noah, they ate, they drank, they married," so it would be in " the days (plural) of the Son of man " : that is, in the process of the coming (growth) of the kingdom in the world. Corruption would ripen (as in the days of Noah) and judgment would come and clear the corruption away—just as it did also in the days of Lot. And Jesus adds " *after the same manner shall it be* in the day that the Son of man is revealed." " In that day " (while the process is going on) " he which shall be on the house-top, and his goods in the house, let him not go down to take them away " : that is, let no one who had embraced the Kingdom, and so stood enlightened above his fellows, endanger his salvation by encumbering him-

self with earthly affairs, nor turn back to evil once he had deserted it. Let him "Remember Lot's wife." 'He who sought only an earthly life would lose the real life, while he who subordinated the earthly life (or treasures) to the heavenly would gain it.' "In that night"—while the area in which a man lived was unilluminated, or only partially so, by the kingdom, there would be "two men in one bed"—each similarly placed—"the one shall be taken and the other left"—one would embrace the kingdom, the other reject it. Two women might "be grinding together," and the same would happen in their case. "Taken?" "Taken?" How confusing to the disciples. "And they answering say unto him, *Where*, Lord?" What a bewildered question. But since they did not understand His words about His "first suffering many things," how could they understand this? Jesus "plays" upon the word "where." "*Where?*" Jesus says laconically. "Where?" "*Where*soever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together"—wherever there is anything effete, divers agencies would remove it. But, as on other occasions, the disciples understood not the saying. How could they? Knowing however, as we now do, both Jesus' conception of "the Kingdom," and the disciples' mentality concerning it at the time when the above passage was uttered, we can, surely, see in it a striking manifestation of the Divine wisdom of Jesus.

H. J. Allen.

FOR EXPOSITION.

(*a*) Matthew vii. 1: *Judge not that ye be not judged.*

In a preface to his translation of Tolstoy's story *Anissia* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1924, pages 24–25) M. Charles Salomon tells this story of a conversation in St. Petersburg years ago. He was driving in the Imperial Gardens, and offered the coachman a cigarette. The Russian refused to take it. "I see," said M. Salomon, "you don't smoke because it is written: 'that which proceeds from the mouth of man is impure,' and, since you believe the text, like the Old-Believers, you refuse to smoke because you think it a sin. Are you an Old-Believer?" "No," the coachman replied, "I am not an Old-Believer. I think there is only one sin, and it is not that." M. Salomon then said, "Well, tell it to me so that I may avoid it. I am a sinner just

as you are." The man stopped his horse for a minute and turning to M. Salomon gravely replied, "There is only one sin; it is to judge your neighbour."

(*b*) Romans ii. 21: *Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?*

In *Napoleon: The Last Phase* (ch. xvi.) Lord Rosebery observes that we do not know what Napoleon thought about religion, though we know what he said about it. "He grasped, no doubt, its political force. He would have understood the military value of the loyal piety of the Tyrolese, or the stern fanaticism of the Covenanters. That he deemed religion essential to a nation he proved by his bold achievement of the Concordat. It is clear, too, that he thought the same of morality, of the sanctity of the family, of public and even private virtue. He was never weary of inculcating them. But it never even occurred to him that these rules were applicable to himself, for he soon regarded himself as something apart from ordinary men."

(*c*) Colossians ii. 2: *That their hearts might be comforted* (παρακληθῶσιν), *being knit together* (συμβιβασθέντες) *in* (ἐν) *love, and unto* (εἰς) *all riches of the full assurance of understanding* (τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως).

Παρακαλεῖσθαι means to be "encouraged," and the underlying idea of what follows is that the mind of a church or of an individual may be lacking in courage simply because it has not learned to grasp the full wealth of the revelation in Christ. Συμβιβάζεσθαι means to be "instructed" in, as in 1 Corinthians ii. 16 (δς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;), and this clause brings out the familiar idea (e.g., Eph. iii. 18) that a loving fellowship is the best atmosphere for learning the truth of Christianity. Πληροφορία denotes "conviction," the conviction that rises from insight (συνέσεως) into truth. And ἐν and εἰς are practically indistinguishable (as e.g., in Eph. i. 15). The apostle is pleading that one of the best ways to reassure faith is to venture upon a larger knowledge of what God's revelation to faith in Christ implies. He is confident that as the grasp of Christian truth enlarges, assurance will be deepened. Hence his prayer and hope. *May their hearts be encouraged!* (The anacolouthon justifies us in treating the next words as independent; they are aspirations developing this introductory thought.) When novel

theosophies, and religious facts become popular around them, *may they learn the meaning of love!* (holding to the common church fellowship, instead of breaking away from it in a proud, superior spirit, as if real "knowledge" were only possible to a coterie of intellectuals). *May they have all the wealth of conviction that comes from insight* into the full meaning of Christ revealed to the love of the Church! For all the answers to life's questions are with Christ. Paul implies, if we may venture to translate his words into modern equivalents, that people would not be carried off by current delusions and plausible religious theosophies if they were better acquainted with the wealth of meaning in their own Christian faith, or if they were better instructed in the principles of their church's belief.

THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON: SOME NOTES.

It is commonly argued that while the three parables of Luke xv. are defensive, the opening parable of Luke xvi. shows us Jesus taking the initiative against his critics. But the parable of Luke xv. 11–32 already implies a criticism of those who had challenged his methods; the second part, which is organic (verses 25–32), is an implicit exposure of their suspicious, hostile attitude towards the taxgatherers and sinners, whose penitence Jesus welcomed.

Ver. 16: *τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος* is a good classical phrase (e.g. Herod. iv. 115 *ἐλθόντες παρὰ τοὺς τοκέας ἀπολάχετε τῶν κτημάτων τὸ μέρος . . . ἐπεὶ τε δὲ ἀπολαχόντες τῶν κτημάτων τὸ ἐπίβαλλον ἦλθον ὀπίσω*), but there are some Aramaisms in the text of the parable, e.g. the *ἤρξατο* of verse 14 and the use of *διδόναι* for *τιθέναι* in verse 22.

Ver. 13: *συναγωγών πάντα*, not "having gathered all together," which would require *συσκευασάμενος*, as Dr. Field pointed out in his *Otium Norvicanse* (iii. p. 68), but "having sold off everything." He realized his patrimony, turned it into cash. *Συνάγειν* in this sense implies *εἰς ἀργύριον*.

Ver. 15: *ἐκολλήθη*. Are we to press this, "he hung on to," as if the man had been one of his former boon-companions?

Ver. 17: *εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθών*, quite a common phrase in Greek for regaining one's senses. It is rather[1] a non-Jewish

[1] Though it occurs in the Test. Jos. iii. 9.

phrase ; the Latin equivalent " redize ad se " is aptly illustrated in a letter of Cicero (*ad Attic.* vii. 3) about his staff in Cilicia, who wanted to plunder the province. " Sed me moverat nemo magis quam is quem tu neminem (' a nobody ') putas. Idem et initio fuerat et nunc est egregius. Sed in ipsa decessione (' just as I was leaving ') significavit sperasse se aliquid, et id, quod animum induxerat paulisper, non tenait, sed cito ad se rediit," i.e. regained his senses after this passing mood of desire for a reward in money.

Μίσθιοι. Three classes of servants are mentioned ; the *μίσθιοι*, who are mere casual labourers, without any close tie to the household, the *παῖδες* or " boys " (as in the modern vocabulary of Englishmen in the East) of verse 26, and the *δοῦλοι* of verse 22, who are household slaves.

Περισσεύουσιν and *περισσεύονται* may differ in this, that the former means " abound in " while the latter might imply " are blessed with abundance of."

Ver. 20 : *κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν*, the kiss (as in Gen. xxxiii. 4, 2 Sam. xiv. 33) marking reconciliation as well as affection.

Ver. 22. Why is *ταχύ* omitted by ℵ B D, etc., as well as by some versions ? Was there an impression in some circles that the pardon must not come too rapidly ? The omission can hardly be accidental.

The ring and shoes are intended to restore his self-respect, among other things ; he was made to feel that, little as he deserved it, he was not to be ranked as a mere slave, with board and lodging.

Ver. 30. The words ring with a scornful contempt for the wastrel. " This (*οὗτος*, derisively) your son (not, my brother) has come (' *venit* dicit ut de alieno loquens, non *rediit* ' ; Bengel) " —all he has to do is to put in an appearance, and you feast him royally !

Ver. 31. If the elder son represents the Pharisees, as Buzy remarks (*Revue Biblique*, 1917, p. 190), then Jesus here, for the purpose of his argument, seems to concede what they claimed (cf. xviii. 9), just as he instantly (verse 32, *ὁ ἀδελφός σου*) rebukes them for their unbrotherly attitude towards the penitent (verse 2).

A REPETITION THAT IS NOT VAIN.

TWICE over Paul tells the Philippian Church that he is only repeating what he has already told them, and that he needs to repeat it.

iii. 1. *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές.*

iii. 18. *οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ λέγω κτλ.*

In the broadest sense, a skilled teacher has to repeat the lessons and principles of his subject in order to drive them home. "Experience shows us," says William Law, "that nothing wants more to be pressed, repeated, and forced upon our minds, than the plainest rules of Christianity. But to the Philippian Church it was a warning against dangerous characters which required to be repeated, at least in the second sentence. Why? Because Paul's previous warnings against these men and their propaganda had not been laid to heart? Perhaps. For the kindly Philippians may have been loth to think so badly of Christian men as Paul felt obliged to think. There is a temperament which is so amiable that it hesitates to scrutinise plausible presentations of Christianity which are really evasions of the truth of the Cross. Paul had already pled with the Church to have more insight (i. 9); it was affectionate and brotherly, but, in his view, too open to outside influences, and too little disposed to think out what was involved in the Gospel. Hence he felt it necessary to repeat his warning, as well as to repeat the exhortation to "rejoice." And his repetitions were vital. Some teachers repeat what they have said, because they have no more to say. Others decline to repeat what they have once said, insisting on their pupils paying sharp attention; Confucius is said to have been such a teacher. But there is a repetition of truth which is varied and vital, and also necessary for certain hearers, and this was Paul's method.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "WOULD you care to explain why your translation differs so sharply from the Authorised Version in Deuteronomy xviii. 15? I thought that this was a prophecy of our blessed Lord as Prophet: *The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.* Surely this is the meaning of the words, for St. Peter expressly quotes the prophecy thus as fulfilled in the Lord Jesus

Christ (see Acts iii. 22). Is there any reason, then, why you render the words *a Prophet* by *prophet after prophet* ? " (T. G. S., Cambridge).

Yes, the reason is that this is the meaning of the original. Moses is contrasting the two religions, of Canaan and of Israel. " While these nations which you are dispossessing listen to mediums and magicians, the Eternal your God has not allowed you to do that. The Eternal your God will raise up for you prophet after prophet like myself from among yourselves ; and to the prophet you must listen "—not to the medium or magician as a seer who reveals the mind of God. The contrast is between a succession of prophets and a succession or order of pagan seers. It is not an individual prophet who is meant, but an institution. When and where the messianic interpretation reflected in Acts iii. 22 arose, it is difficult to say ; perhaps it was among the Samaritans. At any rate, in translating the Old Testament passage, one has to make it clear that " a prophet " denotes a recurring figure, raised up from time to time.

(*b*) " . . . Another difficulty presents itself to my mind in Jeremiah ix. 4. The English versions read, ' for every brother will utterly supplant,' but you translate, ' for a brother will cheat like a Jacob.' Now, I notice that in the margin of our Bible we are referred to Genesis xxvii. 36, but is there any justification for inserting ' Jacob ' in the translation ? " (W. S., Sheffield).

Yes, the Hebrew seems to show that Jeremiah was deliberately referring to Jacob as the crafty schemer of Genesis xxvii. 36, *yâkob yakob*, and this means, as we might say, that every brother will be a perfect or regular Jacob in cheating. As Professor Peake puts it, " the descendants are like their ancestor, each ' Jacobs ' his brother." Those who adopt this rendering are not taking undue liberties with the text, but really bringing out what it contains. You may be interested to see how even in some circles of early Judaism Jacob's conduct was severely criticized ; a popular estimate of it, perhaps in some ancient song, is given in Hosea xii. 3–7, which tallies with this allusion in Jeremiah.

(*c*) " Allow me to ask you why you translate Zechariah i. 5 as you do. Our Bible translates, ' Your fathers, where are they ? and the prophets, do they live for ever ? ' You translate, ' Now your fathers, where are they ? But are there not always

prophets ? ' This alters the sense entirely, though I admit that it makes good sense. But is there any reason for the change ? " (A. N., Aberdeen).

My reason is that the reference here is to the succession of prophets, just as in the case of the passage discussed above with T. G. S. The prophet Zechariah does not mean that prophets cease ; he was himself a prophet, and he believes in the constant ministry of the prophets, for we cannot with Jerome and others think he meant the false prophets. The older generation did not listen to their prophets, i.e. to " the former prophets." That generation has passed. But, says Zechariah, there are always prophets of God to declare His mind and will to each generation. Hence I agree with Professor R. H. Kennett that the verse requires a negative to be supplied, if it is to make sense, in the light of the preceding argument. Otherwise we must suppose that Zechariah regarded the prophets as belonging to the distant past. Now this would surely contradict his position. Sir G. A. Smith, in his *Twelve Prophets* (vol. ii. p. 269), says rightly that Zechariah " is haunted by the remorse of generations who know how they might have obeyed the Divine call, but wilfully did not, and though they have perished, and the prophets have died, and their formulas are no more applicable, the victorious word itself still lives and cries to men with the terrible emphasis of their fathers' experience. All this is the vision of the true prophet, and it was the vision of Zechariah." Exactly ; and therefore he could hardly say that the prophets had all perished, when he himself was fulfilling a prophet's function still. Sellin, who adheres to the traditional text, sees the difficulty, but gets over it by translating verse 6 (which he leaves after verse 5) " did not my words and decrees . . . overtake *you*," reading *ethkem* instead of *abothekem*. Which is rather a desperate conjecture. I much prefer Professor Kennett's ingenious and simple emendation.

(*d*) " I am not a scholar but only an average minister, with sermons to get ready. Will you be able to help me about a text in Proverbs xx. 10 : ' Divers weights and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the Lord ' What I want, sir, is some illustration of this text, to light it up from modern life, and I shall be very grateful if you can supply me with one " (J. B., London).

The only illustration that occurs to me at the moment is an entry in Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journal*, for October 1, 1798, in connexion with a visit to Hamburg. She writes in her diary: "It is the boast and glory of these people to cheat strangers. . . . The Hamburgher shopkeepers have three sort of weights, and a great part of their skill, as shopkeepers, consists in calculating upon the knowledge of the buyer, and suiting him with scales accordingly." Is this modern enough for you? It is certainly apt.

REVIEWS.

Everyman's Life of Jesus. By James Moffatt, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 6*s*.

The year 1924 was quite remarkable for the number of books which it saw issued, the purpose of which is to make the Bible itself intelligible and attractive to "Everyman." The list includes the Cambridgeshire *Syllabus for Religious Education*, followed by the *Children's Bible* in two grades; Reid and Gillie's *The Bible for Youth*; and Arthur Mee's *Children's Bible*. With the same purpose, though on a very different scale, we have had Dr. Moffatt's *Old Testament in English*, and now from the same hand we have a *Life of Jesus* in the language of the Gospels.

It is not a Harmony of the Gospels, that is to say, it is not another attempt to dovetail into a continuous whole all the material contained in the four Gospels. It is a life of Jesus which is at the same time a portrait of Him, constructed out of material, drawn with colours, which the Gospels provide. Dr. Moffatt's work, therefore, apart from the translation, which is already familiar to us, is found in the selection, the classification, the arrangement and, what is very important, the introductions which are prefixed to the different chapters. He treats the incidents of the story and many sections of the teaching as though they had been jewels threaded on four strings: he cuts the strings, and re-arranges the jewels so that they set each other off to best advantage. Thus we find the material grouped in eighteen chapters in an order which corresponds generally to the accepted progress of events, though some of the sections are grouped round subjects rather than events and places. The longest section is naturally "The Last Week"; next to that

comes " How Jesus Taught." Copious use is made of the fourth Gospel. Indeed, Dr. Moffatt adopts the time-scheme which underlies that Gospel and fits into the Marcan framework, which appears to allow for less than one year, Johannine material drawn from three. To speak from general impression it is the Gospel of Luke which has been most drawn upon, then John, Matthew and Mark in that order.

As concerns selection, very little of the contents of the Gospels is unrepresented ; the most conspicuous omissions being perhaps the raising of Lazarus, the man without a wedding garment, a good deal of the Apocalyptic discourse, and most of the criticism of the Pharisees and Scribes. Of significant phrases we miss, e.g., " I am not come to send peace on earth," etc. ; " I am not come to be ministered unto," etc. More conspicuous are the rearrangements, as well as the necessary choices between contrasted arrangements within the Four. Much of the teaching is grouped under topics : " Come unto me " is widely separated from " to whomsoever the Son will reveal him " : and there are numerous cases where phrases and sentences are brought together from different contexts in different Gospels and presented as a connected whole. The events of the Last Week are grouped under each of six successive days, with great advantage to the clearness of the narrative.

Here, however, I must confess to a certain hesitation. The record for " Saturday " begins " Six days before the festival, Jesus came to Bethany ; and a woman called Martha welcomed him to her house." Then follows first the story of Mary and Martha from Luke x. and afterwards the anointing by Mary from John xii. Similarly, under " Sunday " we have " Next day, when he was near Bethphage . . . he despatched two of his disciples." Here the words " Next day " come from John xii., and those that follow from Luke xix. Now, apart from any questions whether these arrangements are right or wrong, one cannot help asking how far it is legitimate to give to such rearrangements the quasi-canonical authority which is involved in printing them without any indication of the widely separated contexts in which different members are found. To the ordinary reader they come with whatever authority he may be prepared to grant to the words of Scripture : and he must have a good memory and an alert mind who would at once recognize that this

is not the familiar text. It is a difficult question: to have provided references would have been unsightly: but there might have been at the end an index showing the sources of sections and even phrases, and indicating the character of the re-arrangements.

To each chapter Dr. Moffatt has prefixed a few pages of very skilful introduction. He gives the situation in which what is coming must be set, in order to its right appreciation. Again and again he deftly precludes a misunderstanding, either the misunderstanding of mistaken critics or the natural misunderstanding of "Everyman." Some very important questions he decides in a way in which not everyone will agree with him, and again we miss any hint that these things are not universally accepted. But in their main effect these introductions are wholly good and valuable.

It would be interesting to discuss the question of loss and gain as between this Life and the four "Lives" with which we are familiar. Loss there is, as we realize when we ask where should we be were this the only life of Jesus left to us. There would be no paradoxes. And Jesus was too big to get on without paradox. There would be no misunderstandings even on the part of those who stood nearest to Him. And again, He was always trying to reveal what was beyond their grasp. There would be no evidences of the impact of His Spirit and His teaching in misapplications and developments of doubtful validity. There would be loss, and yet there is great gain, especially for Everyman. There may be more to add, but the story as we have it here is very beautiful and very moving. The dignity and simplicity, the sympathy and authority of the Figure come out in all their fullness, and His unity with God. When one has read it through one understands how Dr. Moffatt came to write the Epilogue.

C. A. Scott.

* * * * *

Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur. Von Hugo Willrich. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments, Neue Folge. 21 Heft. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924. M. 5.60.

A closely argued study of a hundred pages upon the documents in the Maccabean books and in Josephus which have been fabricated *ad maiorem Judæorum gloriam.* Jewish authors

of the Hellenistic period were disposed to invent correspondence and other forms of literature in order to show that the Jews had been on friendly terms with the Roman authorities. There was a well-known " apologetic " interest at work, in the composition of histories, which throws suspicion upon many of the documents included in them. Willrich's aim is to study them one by one, in order to arrive at a critical choice between the scepticism of scholars like Schubart and the more favourable verdict of E. Meyer and those who agree with him. The title of the essay may lead the reader to expect a discussion of the problem of pseudepigraphy. This would be a valuable contribution to our literary study of antiquity. It is to be hoped that some scholar will write soon a competent account of the ethical and historical developments which led to the production of documents under the names of writers who had no connexion with them. Meantime Willrich confines himself to the special task of analysing the character of such documents in Jewish Hellenistic literature as may be ranked within the class of pseudepigrapha. It is a province where he has already done first-rate work, in his *Judaica*.

The first three chapters leave Josephus with little historical credit, so far as his treatment of sources is concerned (pp. 4–30). Willrich argues that he did not consult the archives, as he alleges that he did, and that his use of Jason of Cyrene is uncritical. Passing on to the two books of Maccabees, Willrich states the case against the authenticity of the letter of Antiochus Epiphanes in 2 Maccabees ix. and the royal letters in 1 Maccabees x.–xv. (pp. 30–44). There is a case for the authenticity of the former (2 Macc. ix. 19 f.), however, to which Willrich barely does justice. He is entirely taken up with critics like Niese and E. Meyer, and ignores French and English work. Hence his argument at this point is less convincing than it would have been, had he, for example, studied " The House of Seleucus " by Mr. Bevan. Granted that the letter is not strictly in keeping with the situation. But that, it might be urged, is a proof that the epitomator did not invent it. The very discrepancies between it and the context tell in favour of the theory that it reflects some authentic document. Willrich pursues his sceptical course even to the point of denying any historical basis to the story of Judas Maccabæus being in treaty with the Romans (p. 44 f.); the

episode described in 1 Maccabees ix. is dismissed as a fiction. As for Jason of Cyrene, whose historical treatise lay behind First and Second Maccabees, Willrich (p. 91 f.) regards him as a contemporary of Philo. This involves a later date for the composition of 2 Maccabees than is usually supposed, i.e., after A.D. 70. Similarly (p. 86 f.) Willrich argues that the Aristeas epistle was not written till the beginning of the Christian era. This is a position already held by him in his *Judaica*, but Willrich, as opposed to Wendland, elaborates his proofs that it was prior to A.D. 33.

The monograph compels a re-examination of the literary problems; it is a searching analysis of what critics like Niese and Wendland and E. Meyer have urged to the contrary.

* * * * *

Jesus de Nazareth Mythe ou Histoire? Par Maurice Goguel. Payot, 106 Boulevard Saint-Germain, Paris, 1925. Pp. 314. Prix 15 francs.

This book marks a recent phase of a controversy which seems to recur from time to time. Sir J. G. Frazer in *The Golden Bough* (part VI. p. 412) concludes that "the doubts which have been cast on the historical reality of Jesus are in my judgement unworthy of serious attention. Quite apart from the positive evidence of history and tradition, the origin of a great religious and moral reform is inexplicable without the personal existence of a great reformer. To dissolve the founder of Christianity into a myth, as some would do, is hardly less absurd than it would be to do the same for Mohammed, Luther, and Calvin. Such dissolving views are for the most part the dreams of students who know the great world chiefly through its pale reflection in books." He holds that "all unprejudiced enquirers" are satisfied about "the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth," although the details of His life and death will "probably always remain shrouded in the mists of uncertainty." This was written in 1900. Then came the controversy stirred by Kalthoff, Jensen, Drews, and Mr. W. B. Smith, along with Mr. J. M. Robertson in this country, who in various ways endeavoured to explain the rise of Christianity apart from any historical Jesus. The facts were restated against them most powerfully by G. Klein, the Swedish rabbi, Adolf Jülicher, Mr. F. C. Conybeare, Professor Case of Chicago, and P. Batiffol.

These scholars patiently show the reasons which make a verdict like Sir J. G. Frazer's inevitable, whatever be the theological interpretation of Christianity. It is a question of history, fundamentally. One does not require to belong to this or that church, or indeed to any church at all, to feel convinced that Christianity was not a fire which happened to light itself. Yet in the *Mercure de France* a French writer ventured to propound this old heresy of history once more, and Professor Goguel now publishes, appropriately enough in the *Bibliothèque Historique*, a positive restatement of the case against Mr. P. L. Couchoud's reprint of these articles in his *Le Mystère de Jésus*. Professor Goguel is not an acrid controversialist. He writes with courtesy as well as with penetration. "The intellectual loyalty of M. Couchoud, the sincerity and vigour of his thought, and the loyal attempt he has made to penetrate the spirit of primitive Christianity, deserve full respect; but this tribute which we are delighted to pay to him does not prevent us from seeing in his book the reverie of a poet rather than the work of a historian."

We have first (pp. 9–34) an account of the various efforts made to explain Christianity without an historical Jesus; then, as usual, an examination of the extra-Christian evidence from Josephus, Tacitus, etc. (pp. 35–55), and a refutation of the hypothesis that there was a pre-Christianity before Jesus (pp. 56–81). Professor Goguel makes his points ably and succinctly. He proceeds to show how the very attacks on Christianity in the early period all presuppose an actual Jesus, and how the early heresy of Docetism implies it (p. 82 f.). Finally he addresses himself to what is the main subject of his book, a critical examination of the New Testament literature, especially of the historical tradition involved in the gospels. The data prove, he argues, that any notion such as that proposed by M. Couchoud, viz., that the gospel story rose out of dreams and raptures, partly suggested by the Old Testament, is not to be seriously entertained. His conclusion deserves to be quoted in his own words. "Entre la prédication du Royaume de Dieu faite par Jésus et la doctrine du salut élaborée et développée dans l'Église, il y a plus qu'une simple coincidence dans le temps, il y a une relation organique. C'est à cause de l'impression produite par Jésus que l'Église a professé sa doctrine de la rédemption. Si cette doctrine a quelque parenté avec les

religions de mystères, elle s'en distingue cependant et ne peut être ramenée à elles. Tandis que les adorateurs de Mithra, d'Attis, et d'Adonis savaient bien que l'histoire redemptrice de leur héros plongeait dans une si fabuleuse antiquité qu'elle en perdait toute réalité, les Chrétiens avaient le sentiment que ce n'était pas au commencement mais à la fin des temps que leur Christ avait vécu. Sa vie s'insérait, pour eux, d'une manière très étroite, dans la réalité de l'histoire " (pp. 307, 308).

The public for whom Professor Goguel has written this scholarly and lucid treatise is naturally composed of French readers who have been impressed by M. Couchoud's articles. But the first of these articles has been translated into English, and, although English readers have a literature of their own upon this subject, it is right to draw attention to Professor Goguel's refutation, especially as it contains much more than a merely negative criticism. He writes from the standpoint of Liberal Protestantism. His pages are full of sound judgment, and his French is an easy pleasure to read.

One or two critical opinions are worth notice. (*a*) Jesus was crucified in A.D. 28, and Paul's conversion was towards the close of 29 (p. 100 f.); this is probably too early, but his sound point is that the apostle could hardly be mistaken in assuming that Jesus had really lived. (*b*) An excellent passage on *The Ascension of Isaiah*, in pages 113–117, showing that this apocalypse does not contain a pre-Christian myth upon which Saul drew in 1 Corinthians ii. 8 and Philippians ii. 5–11. (*c*) The phrase " before Pontius Pilate " in 1 Timothy vi. 12–14 is not an anti-docetic touch, but—here Goguel agrees with Baldensperger—intended to recall the open confession of Jesus as an example for those who are haled before Roman authorities on account of their faith (p. 175–180). (*d*) A careful discussion of the effect of belief in the fulfilment of messianic prophecy upon the gospel-narratives (p. 196 f.); sometimes this created stories, as in the case of the flight to Egypt (Matt. ii. 16–18), but more often it merely modified stories or added a detail (e.g. in Matt. xxi. 14–16). Goguel, it should be said, freely admits that Jesus was often deeply impressed by some Old Testament prediction, e.g. in Matthew xiv. 62 and xv. 34. (*e*) The admission that there are some mythical elements in the gospel-story, e.g. the mention of the darkness at the crucifixion,

proves (p. 258 f.) that such elements did not enter at the creative origin of the gospel-tradition, but during the course of its literary development.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Most expositors regard the twenty-third Psalm as a meditation upon God's gracious responsibility, which regards Him as a shepherd, a guide, and a host. But some think that the entire Psalm may be taken as a shepherd-song, and Mr. John Freeman's *Life on the Uplands* (Hodder and Stoughton, 3*s.* 6*d.*) is an admirable exposition on these lines. The book had a cordial reception seventeen years ago, and this is a timely reprint. It contains ten chapters, to each of which a prayer is prefixed. Those who like really good books of devotional stimulus may be confidently assured that this will meet their needs.

* * * * *

In *The Imprisoned Splendour* (Hodder and Stoughton, 7*s.* 6*d.*), which he calls a study in human values, Mr. J. H. Chambers Macaulay sets himself to interpret the spiritual and moral content of Christianity to the ordinary man. Christianity possesses a human intensity, born of its divine essence. "There is a new creative urge behind the individual and social movements of the hour," which is in keeping with the persistent Divine aim of releasing the inward splendour of faith and freedom within human nature. This divine aim, Mr. Macaulay shows, is revealed in Jesus Christ, and some of the finest passages in his book are those which insist upon the reality of the Incarnation. The book covers a wide range. But it does not lose its impetus as it proceeds. Religious writing upon a subject like this is often suspected of being vague and of becoming either hectic or languid. One merit of Mr. Macaulay's writing is that it is alive with hopefulness and keen passion. The chapters upon "The Investment of Love" and "The Pledge of Progress," for example, are admirable specimens of an optimism which is charged with moral demand as well as with encouragement.

* * * * *

Dr. Trevor H. Davies has a high reputation in the Canadian pulpit, and his sermons on *The Inner Circle* (Hodder and Stough-

ton, 8*s.* 6*d.*) show how vivacious and fresh he can be. They are on men and women with whom our Lord is said in the gospels to have come into touch ; perhaps one ought to say, men and a woman, for Mary Magdalene is the only woman, the other thirteen characters being men. Judas Iscariot is discussed under " The Doom of the Materialist," and Peter's life is sketched as " A Study of the Sanguine Temperament." The sermons are amply illustrated ; Dr. Davies draws upon literature and history to lighten up his arguments.

* * * * *

The Acts of the Apostles (London: Thomas Murby and Co., 4*s.* net) is the revised re-issue of Dr. Charles Knapp's volume, which has already won favour in Murby's New Smaller Scripture Manuals. The two original volumes are now compressed into one, the notes have been re-cast, and the text is the Revised Version instead of the Authorised. The book is written out of a knowledge of what schools need, in manuals of Bible instruction. Dr. Knapp understands that " the true aim of education is the formation of character, and the true aim of Scripture teaching the imparting of *religious* knowledge." This conception determines the form and matter of the notes ; they are not only interesting and relevant, but also suggestive, in the best sense of the term. For the purposes of instruction, this is an excellent manual, and its *format* is exactly what is required.

* * * * *

Dr. Mackintosh Mackay's book of sermons on *The Men Whom Jesus Made* (Hodder and Stoughton, 6*s.*) resembles Dr. Davies' book ; it is characterized by a similar knowledge of human nature and an equal power of making old things live. Dr. Mackay confines himself, however, to the twelve apostles. For him Judas Iscariot is " The Man whom Jesus could not make." Dr. Mackay's previous volumes have earned him a place among preachers whose message appeals to a wider public than their own congregations. The present volume has been written in response to a request from his American readers, but there will be many in this country who will welcome so honest and invigorating a series of discourses.

* * * * *

The success of *Liberal Evangelicalism* has led to the publication of another book by members of the same group or party in the

Church of England. *The Inner Life* (Hodder and Stoughton, 6*s*.) is a collection of fourteen essays, specially intended to show how the Liberal Evangelicals interpret the inward relations of God and man. They include a paper on "The Rise and Growth of Man's Spiritual Consciousness," by the Bishop of Birmingham, an essay by Canon Raven, on "Sin and Salvation," a discussion of "The Church in the World," by Dean Burroughs, and quite an excellent essay on "The Devotional Use of the Bible," by Mrs. Rogers. The editor, Canon Rogers, in a straightforward introduction explains the aim of the book and the principles of the Liberal Evangelicals. He remarks, apropos of the Keswick Convention, that "the Church stands in need of a Convention" on broader lines than Keswick, and that the Keswick message should be thought out afresh "in the light of scientific facts and in terms of modern psychology," in order to be presented with effect. The present volume shows that there are members of the Church of England who are well able to do this service No one can read the pages of this volume without feeling impressed by the width of mind and genuine spirit of its writers; it is a gratifying proof of the renascence of evangelicalism in forms that will make an increasing appeal to the modern English world.

* * * * *

If any readers shrink from a mystical interpretation of Nature, they should read Miss Constance L. Maynard's *The Kingdom of Heaven is Like* (Religious Tract Society, 2*s*. 6*d*.). Miss Maynard has a Cambridge training, and she has also a Christian faith. It is not easy to praise too highly the quality of this small book of hers. Seldom does one come across so beautiful and clear a spirit, in this department. The devotional scientist is not a common phenomenon, but here is a book which breathes the air of scientific mysticism, without being fanciful. The aim of it is stated in a sentence like this: "We who endeavour to attract and lead into the new life the crude and infinitely lovable minds of the generation that surrounds us, want to found on solid reason and establish before their faces the one great truth, that this world's interests are not the whole of that which lies within reach, but that there is a real, objective, authoritative spiritual world lying within arm's length, and ready to be revealed to those who long for it." And these words are written by "Con-

stance L. Maynard, Moral Science Tripos, Cambridge; First Principal of Westfield College, University of London."

* * * * *

The volume of addresses to children, called *Turn But a Stone* (Hodder and Stoughton, 3*s.* 6*d.*), which has been written by Rev. Archibald Alexander, B.D., is a collection of fifty pulpit talks to children in St. John's Wood Presbyterian Church. They well deserve to be sent out to a wider audience. Mr. Alexander has the first requisite for this kind of work, he can forget the adults in his congregation while he is speaking to the children. Also, he has imagination and a deftness in handling his subjects. "Better a moral running through a story than one trailed after it." This is sound, and it is one of the many sensible qualities which make the book a success. We can recommend it to ministers who try to do this kind of thing on Sundays; it will give them hints and suggestions on almost every page.

* * * * *

Mr. A. C. Bruce's *Ego Sum* (Religious Tract Society, 6*s.*) is, in the author's words, "a study of some aspects of the logic of personality." It is addressed to young men especially, out of a long experience of their difficulties, an account of the human self and of its ideal and completion in God's likeness. Mr. Bruce explains this from the Bible devoutly and freshly. He shows how Christ is the second "I AM," the link between the human and the Divine personality.

* * * * *

Six Days of the Week (Hodder and Stoughton, 7*s.* 6*d.*) is a charming, original book by Dr. Henry Van Dyke, a collection of short papers upon religion and life, devotional, practical, and shrewd. The fairest way of reviewing it is to give a specimen. The text *Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live* (Exod. xxii. 18) is printed, for example, under the heading of The New Witchcraft. Then the meditation follows. Dr. Van Dyke prints each of his sentences separately, but for the sake of space they are here printed one after another. "This was the text by which our forefathers in England and New England foolishly tried to justify the persecution and killing of supposed witches in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The latest execution of this kind in Great Britain was in 1722. But witchcraft, the practice of sorcery, magic, and necromancy, was not thereby

suppressed. It has existed in every age known to man; and in our own it seems to be flourishing with exuberance. Its name is changed, but not its nature. In every city you may see the signs of the practitioners of the ancient profession. They call themselves clairvoyants, psychic mediums, telepaths, soul analysts, metaphysical seers, and even psychologists—as if their craft were a real science and not a black art. I do not include here those people who are earnestly and reverently seeking and testing evidence of existence after death; I include those who for pay profess to reveal the future, foretell destiny, discover hidden secrets, and call up departed spirits. These are the new witches. The old command, Thou shalt not suffer them to live, is out of date. The new command should be, Thou shalt not help them to make a living. I think that would put the modern Witch of Endor out of business."

* * * * *

Mr. St. George Lane Fox Pitt has published a new and enlarged edition of his book on *The Purpose of Education* (Cambridge University Press, 4*s*.), which first appeared in 1913. The aim of the book is to examine "educational problems in the light of recent scientific research." The author studies experimental psychology in order to understand the meaning and movements of the mind, which is under education, but his main interest is in the situation created by the relation between the human spirit and its ideals. The late Professor Boutroux, in commending an earlier edition, welcomed the book as a contribution towards the real aim of all education, viz. "the reconciliation of science, which makes us know the action of the environment or of things upon the human consciousness, with religion which gives to our inner dispositions their highest and most beautiful form." It is certainly a stimulating discussion of instincts and reason, with a first emphasis upon the moral ideals of man.

* * * * *

Mr. Harold M. Wiener's three lectures, in *Early Hebrew History* (London: Robert Scott, 5*s*.), discuss "Some Factors in Early Hebrew History," "The Law of Change in the Bible," and "The Biblical Doctrines of Joint, Hereditary, and Individual Responsibility." The first essay sketches the various checks to the force of centrifugalism in Israel. Mr. Wiener's higher criticism

leads him, in this connexion, to reject the extant tradition of 1 Samuel xiii. 8–14; "it is so discreditable to Samuel as to be incredible." He recognizes that the duplicate stories in First Samuel offer an intricate problem. "The natural process of deterioration to which every MS. text is subject and the editorial methods employed have tended to obscure the course of events further." An appendix on the Septuagint and the Massoretic text of 1 Kings contains the admission that the former "represents a far earlier text, on the whole," while historically the latter is "full of self-contradictions and impossible statements." This is a much more sound method than to suggest, as is done in the second essay, that differences in the legislative provisions of the Old Testament were often due to Moses himself, who changed and modified earlier laws of his own. In the third essay Mr. Wiener is obliged to fall back upon the sounder critical method, however. Who incited David to take a census of Israel? God, says the primitive tradition in 2 Samuel xxiv.; Satan, says the later Chronicles (1 Chron. xxi. 1). "I think it probable," Mr. Wiener remarks, "that the original text referred it to a baal, and that 1 Samuel represents one scribal correction, 1 Chronicles another" (p. 94). The tradition in any case, we are told, does not represent "the considered and authoritative teaching of the Old Testament" upon solidarity; "the particular colouring given to the facts is due to a mistaken philosophy of history on the part of the narrator."

* * * * *

Up To The Hills (Hodder and Stoughton, 6*s*.) is an anthology of devotional verse and prose edited by Mr. Carey Bonner. A reference to some passage of Scripture is given, after which quotations are printed that bear upon the theme. The selections have been made with care and taste. Mr. Bonner has compiled and arranged them admirably, and the book will be a favourite in households where such reading is wisely prized. A special word of praise is due to the printers for the beauty of their work.

CURRENT ISSUES.

People ask and debate, What is the gospel? But they sometimes forget that, in order to answer this question, it is well to determine first of all what the gospel is not. If they made up their minds on this preliminary point, if they eliminated certain misconceptions, they might be more successful than they often are in reaching a positive and satisfactory answer to their query.

* * * * *

In his recent book, *The Gospel and the Modern Mind*, Dr. W. R. Matthews wisely remembers to distinguish the gospel from some things with which it is commonly associated. We must not, he remarks, identify it with the Christian religion, for the Christian religion has not always been the pure product of the gospel. Nor must we identify it with Christian institutions, for the gospel is the original source of all such institutions, in so far as they are Christian, yet they are not the gospel-message itself. He points out frankly the "unecclesiastical nature of the teaching of Jesus," and reiterates that the gospel lies behind both Church and Bible. "No doubt," he declares, "most people will find it hard to abstract the thought of the essence of their religion from its association with Church and sacraments," but the latter, after all, are merely the expression and instruments of the gospel.

* * * * *

Then he warns his readers against assuming that the whole gospel is to be found in the four gospels of the New Testament. This is a point made by the late Principal Forsyth, who urged it emphatically, as he pled for the validity of the apostolic interpretation. You, he said to his opponents, you select certain words of Jesus from the first three gospels, and take your stand upon them, as though His words were the final expression

of His personality. But, in doing so, " Are you not in bondage to the bad old idea of revelation, namely, that it consists of a teaching rather than a person, of statement or precept rather than act, of a complete truth rather than a finished deed ? " So Dean Matthews argues in his own way. He notes the fallacy of some Liberal Protestants, who too often assume " that the Gospels are the text and the Epistles only comment. The truth is that both text and comment are inextricably intermingled—the person and words of Jesus are mediated through the experience of the first Christian generation." He denies that there is any foundation for the idea that the apostolic teaching is no more than a spoiled version of the simple ethical teaching of Jesus.

* * * * *

Lord Rowton once asked Beaconsfield what he considered was the most remarkable, the most self-sustained and powerful sentence known to him. The reply was, " Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." It is a sentence which clinches the teaching of Jesus against worry. " Take no thought for the morrow : for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

* * * * *

" Take no thought " means " do not worry," and the Christian religion is meant to deliver us from worry. Yet it is often actually the cause of worry. Dr. Thouless writes in the *Congregational Quarterly* an article on " Religion and Mental Conflict," in which he notices this perversion of the truth. A person disposed to worry, as he says, " may, by accepting the beliefs of religion find relief for his worrying in confidence in an all-powerful and all-wise God." This is the line marked out by Jesus. But, on the other hand, the same person " may simply find in his religion new things to worry about—formal observances, trivial points of doctrine, the various possibilities that he has sinned without knowing it, and so on."

* * * * *

Worry of this kind is one of the minor disorders of life, and Dr. Thouless defines it happily. " Worry is the painful effect of the persistence in the mind of impulses which can have no useful outlet in behaviour."

* * * * *

It is a special pleasure to welcome, in this number of THE

Expositor, a contribution from New Zealand. Dr. Ranston is a Methodist scholar in Auckland, and his paper on "The Orphic Mysteries" will clear up the subject for many readers who are unfamiliar with the origin and aim of these mystery-religions. Dr. Ranston has just published a study of "Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature," which strikes out along fresh lines. We hope to review this important monograph before long.

* * * * *

The article by Mr. Dallas follows up the allusion made by Professor C. A. Scott (p. 28) to Heiler's remarkable volume. We make no apology for printing another article on prayer. Christianity has been called "the religion of prayer," and there is no aspect of it which requires more attention, practically and theoretically, than that of prayer. Our English literature is rich in modern studies, as Dr. Scott has shown. But the Swedish scholar has things to say which are vital, and, as his book is still untranslated, Mr. Dallas has done good service in explaining what are its main contentions.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS.

Recent criticisms of the documentary hypothesis.

I. Ex. 6^3—a central position.
   1. Part of a passage full of characteristic phrases linking it to other passages.
   2. Five specially important words and phrases.
   3. Conclusion. Ex. 6^{3-12} is one of a series of related passages.

II. Attempts to discredit the prima facie meaning of Ex. 6^3.
   1. Naville: his incorrect paraphrase; his misunderstanding of the critical position.
   2. Dahse and Wiener: ἐδήλωσα; 'Yahweh not used in self revelations'; theory as to self-use of Name.
   3. Dahse rewrites the verse with the help of the LXX; eliminates El Shaddai both from Ex. 6^3 and from Genesis (except in 49^{25}); and does the same with Yahweh in Ex. 6^3.

III. Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, based on the Divine Names.

1. The basis. Not the Divine Names only; broader foundation employing other criteria.

Objections to these as (*a*) subjective; (*b*) often failing to give any sure result. Answers.

2. Möller, W. H. Green, etc.: significance of the Divine Names. Baumgärtel's position.

Article 2. Recent Criticism, with Special Reference to Exodus 6^{2-3}.

In our first article we saw that certain scholars had in the last twenty-five years called in question the soundness of the current theory of the composition and age of the component parts of the Pentateuch, and we prepared the way for an examination of the arguments they adduced by reminding ourselves of

(1) The Problem presented by the Pentateuch as it stands;

(2) The Solution set forth by the current documentary theory; and

(3) Some specimens of the alternative theories.

We are now in a position to take up, one after the other, the above-mentioned criticisms and to seek to arrive at a just estimate of their worth.

I. *Exodus* 6^{2-3}: *its prima facie meaning and its context.*

It will be quite clear from what we have already seen that Ex. 6^{2-3} with its context is, so far as the use of the Divine Names is concerned, a central position of the documentary theory. Unless the prima facie meaning of that passage can be proved to be wrong, the existence of at least two documents in Genesis, one of which uses the name Yahweh and the other does not, must be regarded as beyond question. Accordingly attempts to set aside that meaning have been made by dissentient critics on various lines. In order to estimate their strength, we must first make a careful study of the passage in question.

1. We note that it does not stand alone. It forms part of a longer passage of eleven verses (verses 2–12), which is full of characteristic phrases that link it on to other passages of a similar type. If anyone will take the trouble to look up the occurrences of the following phrases: 'established my covenant,' 'land of Canaan,' 'land of their sojournings,' 'remembered my covenant,' 'redeem' (Heb. gā'al, ctr. pādāh in Dt.), 'judgments,' 'be to you a God,' 'spake unto—saying,' they will see that this passage has affinity with Gen. 6^{9-22}, 9^{1-17}, 17, 23, etc., and that some of these phrases are found also in Ezekiel.

2. In addition to the above, there are five words and phrases in Ex. 6^{2-3} which deserve special attention.

(*a*) 'I' (Heb. 'ănî). In Hebrew two parallel forms of the personal pronoun, first person singular, ('ănî and 'ānōkî) maintained their position for a time side by side, but a growing preference for the shorter form is to be seen in the later writings. This may be shown in tabular form as follows:

Book.	'ani.	'anoki.	
1 and 2 Samuel . .	50	50	
Jeremiah	54	37	
Ezekiel	138	1	
Lam., Hag., Ezr., Est., Eccl.	45	0	
Chronicles	30	1	(1 Chr. 17^{1} from 2 Sam. 7^{2})
Daniel	23	1	(10^{11})

In Deut. with its rhetorical style 'anoki is habitually used.

It would appear significant that in the passages in Gen.–Numb. assigned by the dominant hypothesis to JE the proportion is—

	'ani	'anoki	
	48	81	
while in the P passages it is	130	1	(Gen. 23^{4}).

In Ex. 6^{2-12} 'ani is used 6 times, 4 times in the phrase, 'I am Yahweh,' once in verse 5, 'I have heard,' once in verse 12, 'I am of uncircumcised lips.'

(*b*) 'I am Yahweh' ('ani YHWH) in Ex. $6^{2,6,8,29}$ and 12^{12}. Nu. $3^{31,41,45}$. Lev. 18–26 (20 times).

The phrase also occurs with amplifications as follows:

'I am Yahweh your God' (Lev. 11^{44}).

'I am Yahweh that brought you up out of the land of Egypt' (Lev. 11^{45}).

'shall know that I am Yahweh' (Ex. 7^{5}, $14^{4,18}$).

'shall know that I am Yahweh your God' (Ex. 16^{12}).

'shall know that I am Yahweh your God that bringeth you (brought them) out from . . .' (Ex. 6^{7}, 29^{46}).

'May know that I am Yahweh which sanctifieth you' (Ex. 31^{13}).

All these uses occur in sections assigned by the current theory to P. 'I ('ani) am Yahweh' also occurs in Gen. 15^{7} (a passage which shows many signs of being composite) and 28^{13}. Compare ''anoki Yahweh' in Ex. $20^{2,5}$ (? from the parallel passage, Dt. $5^{6,9}$), Hos. $12^{10\,(9)}$, 13^{4}, Ps. $81^{11\,(10)}$, Isa. 43^{11}, 44^{24} (51^{12}). The formula 'know that I am Yahweh' occurs rarely outside definite P sections (Ex. 7^{17}, $8^{18\,(22)}$, 10^{2}, Dt. $29^{5(6)}$, 1 Ki. $20^{13,28}$) until suddenly we find it brought into constant use by Ezekiel (62 times).

(*c*) 'And I *appeared* unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai' (EV God Almighty), cp.

Gen. 17^{1}: 'and Yahweh *appeared* unto Abraham and said unto him: I am El Shaddai.'

$35^{9,11}$: 'and Elohim *appeared* unto Jacob, . . . and Elohim said unto him: I am El Shaddai.'

48^{3}: 'Jacob said unto Joseph: El Shaddai *appeared* unto me in Luz.' The verb is in the Niphal mood, which has primarily a reflexive force, but 'equally characteristic is its frequent use . . . to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself' (Gesenius-Kautzsch. § 51, c). In the above passages God is said to 'allow Himself to be seen.' The force of this particular verb, when in

the Niphal mood, is well seen in 1 Ki. 18^{1}: 'Go, shew thyself unto Ahab' (see further under (*e*)).

(*d*) El Shaddai, see the passages quoted under (*c*). See also 28^{3}, 43^{14}, 49^{25} (El should clearly be read here [instead of 'eth,' the Heb. sign of the object] as do Samaritan, LXX, Syr., Targum of Jonathan, Saad., 4 Heb. MSS.). In 49^{25} the title occurs in what is obviously an early poem. In the other passages it seems to be used as an archaic title, no longer in colloquial use. It only occurs once again in the Old Testament. It is significant that this once is in Ezekiel (10^{5}).*

(*e*) 'But by (or 'as to') my name YHWH I was not known to them.' The verb is in the Niphal and has the same force as the corresponding verb in (*c*). It should be translated: 'I did not make myself known to them.' This force of the same verb in the Niphal is clearly seen in Ruth 3^{3}, 'make not thyself known unto the man.' There are four significant parallel uses of the same verb in the same mood in Ezekiel.

Ez. 20^{5}: 'In the day when I chose Israel . . . and *made myself known unto them* in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up mine hand unto them, saying, I am Yahweh your God; in that day I lifted up mine hand unto them, to bring them forth out of the land of Egypt. . . .'

20^{9}: '. . . the nations (AV the heathen) in whose sight *I made myself known unto them* in bringing them forth. . . .'

35^{11}: 'I will do according to mine anger . . . and *I will*

* Shaddai without El occurs in an early poem (Nu. $24^{4,16}$ Balaam) and in later literature in Ruth $1^{20,21}$, Ps. $68^{15\,(14)}$, 91^{1}, Joel 1^{15} (= Is. 13^{6}), E-ek. 1^{24}, and 31 times in Job (5^{17}, etc.). Neither the Greek translators nor any others seem to have had any real clue to its meaning. In the Pentateuch the LXX translates El Shaddai by ὁ θεός with a possessive pronoun. In Ezek. 10^{5} Shaddai is transliterated. In 14 Job passages it is translated παντοκράτωρ (Almighty). Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and sometimes LXX (Ruth) translated by ἱκανός in accordance with the Rabbinic explanation of Shaddai as compounded of Shĕ and dai (as if = self-sufficient), an explanation not accepted by any modern scholars.

make myself known among them [i.e. the children of Israel], when I have judged thee [i.e. Edom].'

38^{23}: 'And I will magnify myself . . . and *I will make myself known* in the eyes of many nations and they shall know that I am Yahweh.'

In the first two of the above passages Ezekiel, like the writer of Ex. $6^{2.3}$, looks back to the time just before the Exodus as the time when the God of Israel 'made himself known to them' by a new name and by an accompanying manifestation of his power.

3. In view of the above stylistic phenomena it would seem an eminently reasonable conclusion that Ex. 6^{2-12} forms part of a series of passages, which hang together and which among other peculiarities avoid up to this point the use of the name Yahweh.

II. *Efforts to explain away the prima facie meaning.*

1. M. Naville, in *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch* (English Translation by J. R. Mackay, 1923), gives the following as his rendering of Ex. 6^{3}: 'I revealed myself to the fathers as their own God, but I did not make known to them that I am Jahveh' (p. 69).* 'Their own God' he takes from the LXX; the second part of the rendering is an incorrect paraphrase, not a translation. M. Naville expands this into 'I said to Abraham, I am Jahveh, that brought thee forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, in order to give thee this land †; but I did not make known to him what this expression, I am Jahveh, means, for my promise was not yet fulfilled, and I have not even yet manifested to the Israelites by my acts that I am Jahveh'; and again, 'Thus the Israelites should know Jahveh, not at all by his saying to them: My proper name is Jahveh,

* In dealing with M. Naville I, like his translator (pp. 69–70), use the French form of the Divine Name.

† This is a reference to Gen. 15^{7}.

but by his acts. I am Jahveh *means* I am the God that manifests Himself, that maketh Himself known by His acts, of which some are acts of judgment and others acts of mercy.' * In other words M. Naville says that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did know the proper name Jahveh, but they did not know its meaning; that was only known, when He shewed His judgments upon Pharaoh and His mercies upon Israel. A number of passages, in which the phrase 'Ye shall know that I am Jahveh' occurs, are quoted to shew that to 'know' Jahveh means to experience His power (see quotations in I. 2 (*b*)).

If we want to know what M. Naville would have liked the writer of Ex. 6 to have written, this is excellent; but if we want to know what that writer really did say, it is most misleading. 'I am Jahveh and I appeared unto Abraham . . . as El Shaddai, but by *my name* Jahveh I did not make myself known unto them' can only mean one thing. To know anyone by his name is one thing; to know his nature and power is another. To know by experience the power and grace of Jahveh is an infinitely greater thing than to know the mere name Jahveh, but that does not justify us in quietly substituting one for the other and saying that the Biblical writer really meant the one although he said the other. Of course in many passages the knowledge of experience is promised and set forth, but in this particular passage a prior knowledge is referred to. The God of the Patriarchs was going to manifest His power on behalf of His people and, as a token and pledge of this new display of power, He here and now made Himself known by a new name. Hitherto He had spoken of Himself as El Shaddai; now and henceforth He is to be known as Jahveh.

* (pp. 69–70). If 'I am Jahveh' means this in Ex. 6^2, why did it not mean the same in Gen. 15^7?

M. Naville as a matter of fact completely misunderstands the theory which he is criticizing. According to him 'the critics,' as he calls them, assert (*a*) that one writer (J) believed and wrote 'that Jahveh from the beginning was worshipped under that name and that Abraham entered into covenant with Jahveh and received the promises. Jahveh was the national God of Israel, because first He was the God of their forefather Abraham.

(*b*) That another writer (P) denies all this. Abraham never did enter into covenant with Jahveh. Jahveh was not the God of Abraham. He could not be, because Jahveh was not known before Moses (pp. 77–79). 'The Critics,' it is surely hardly necessary to say, assert nothing so foolish. J and P, in their view, are absolutely at one in believing that the God of Israel is the very same God as Abraham worshipped, with whom he entered into covenant and who promised him the land of Canaan. There is no difference whatever between them on that point. That upon which they do differ is simply as to the *Name* by which God was known to Abraham. J regards the name Jahveh as known from the beginning. P thinks that God appeared to Abraham as El Shaddai and that He did not make Himself known as Jahveh until He revealed that name to Moses. It would never have occurred to the priestly writer that anyone could imagine that he thought of El Shaddai and Jahveh as different Gods. They were to him only two different names for one and the same God. The covenant was with the One God, whatever the actual name by which He was called. His great point was that the God of Abraham in the days of Moses manifested His power in a very wonderful new way and that, as a token and pledge of this new departure, He revealed Himself under a new name. This idea is not confined to Ex. 6. We have already seen that it runs implicitly in a whole series of passages in

Genesis in which El Shaddai and Elohim are used and Jahveh is not used (for Jahveh in 17^1 see p. 15 in July number). The facts are too clear to be got rid of on M. Naville's lines. I think I have said enough to shew (1) that Mr. Naville does not understand 'the Critics' and (2) that he has failed to explain away the plain meaning of Ex. 6.*

2. A second attempt to get away from the prima facie meaning of Ex. 6^{2-3} is adopted by J. Dahse in Germany and H. M. Wiener in England.† They point out in the first place that the LXX translates nōda'tī (AV and RV I was known) by *ἐδήλωσα*. That, they say, indicates that the translators read hoda'ti (the causative mood instead of the Niphal mood) with the meaning: 'I made known' (my name). Even if they did, it does not follow that their reading is the right one.‡ But it is not clear that they did. As we have seen (I 2 (*c*) and (*e*)) the Niphal mood has the force, 'I did not make myself known' (and so RVm.). No change of reading is therefore necessary and the parallelism with the other verb in the same sentence is in favour of the Niphal form. The exact form of the verb is not however of any importance. What is of importance is whether the interpretation put upon the word by these two writers is the right one or not. They would restrict the meaning to self-revelations. The name Yahweh, they say, was known to, and used by, the Patriarchs, but Yahweh did not use it Himself in revelations. It is true that in Gen. 15^7 and 28^{13} the Hebrew text asserts that He did, but this they

* There is much else that might be said about M. Naville's views and theories, but I am obliged to confine myself here to the one point as to the true interpretation of the passage in Ex. 6.

† J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. H. M. Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*. Elliot Stock, 1912.

‡ The Samaritan Pentateuch, one of the Targums, and all known Heb. MSS. but one, support the Masoretic text. The value of the LXX as an authority for the determination of the original Hebrew text will be considered in Article 3, Parts II and III.

would set aside on the ground that the LXX in 15^{7} reads ὁ θεὸς and in 28^{13} omits Yahweh altogether.* But what difference is there between the use of the name in self-revelations and the use of it on the lips of men? Mr. Wiener answers † that (1) a number of Old Testament passages shew that the Israelites regarded the Divine Name as having *an objective existence* of its own.‡ (2) Sir J. G. Frazer and others have recorded the intense aversion of 'many savages' to uttering their own name, though they have no objection to being accosted by it or even to its being divulged to a stranger by a third person. Among early Hebrews similar ideas prevailed.§ So in Ex. 3^{14}, in answer to Moses' question: When the children of Israel say to me, What is His name? what shall I say unto them? God evades the question with the words 'I am that I am' and refuses to give His name directly, but in $^{15, 16, 18}$ Moses, as a third person, is authorized to give it indirectly. In 5^{23} Moses implies that something more was needed than this indirect use of the Divine Name and in 6^{2} God responds by giving a new guarantee of Divine assistance—not the introduction of a new name, but a new direct use of the already known name, viz. in a self-revelation, which pledged Yahweh in a new way, a way which would be convincing to the Israelites in their then intellectual condition.

This is ingenious, but, in answer, it is sufficient to say that (1) the passages referred to in no way prove either that the Israelites had any aversion to uttering their own name || or (still less) that they or Moses himself attributed

* ADEM 15 cursives and 1 Egyptian version omit, but 12 cursives and 4 versions, including the Old Latin, agree with the Hebrew text.

† *Essays*, pp. 45–56.

‡ See Deut. 28^{58}, Lev. 19^{12}, Ex. $23^{20\,f.}$, etc. The italics are Mr. Wiener's own.

§ See Gen. 32^{29}, Judg. $13^{17\,f.}$.

|| Gen. $45^{3, 4}$, 'I am Joseph,' supplies an exact parallel to 'I am Yahweh.' Jacob (Gen. 32^{27}) and Ruth (Ru. 3^{9}) have no aversion to giving their own name.

this 'savage' superstition, as to the danger of uttering one's own name, to their God; (2) it is impossible to understand how, *on Old Testament principles*, without a self-revelation on the part of God, the Patriarchs could know and use the Divine Name Yahweh at all. To suppose that man invented this name for his God, in the same way that, according to Gen. 2^{19}, "the man called every living creature," would indeed be a modern notion. The use of the name Yahweh in Genesis is explained by 'the dominant hypothesis' as being due to a writer who believed that even before the Flood God revealed Himself as Yahweh. That is reasonable. If on the other hand we are to see in Genesis the work of only one author and if we are to accept the theory that there was no self-revelation of the Name before Ex. 6^2, no explanation of how the Name came to be used in earlier days seems possible.

3. Dahse, in addition to the attempt just dealt with, endeavours to rewrite Ex. $6^{2,3}$ with the help of the LXX and thus to evacuate it of all significant meaning. I think that he would acknowledge that, as it stands, it can only bear the prima facie meaning. But that, he would say, is not the original form of the passage. (*a*) He points to the well-known fact that the LXX translates El Shaddai by *ὁ θεός* with a possessive pronoun ('thy' twice, 'my' 4 times, including 49^{25}, once 'their'). It has been an axiom in Textual Criticism that, other things being equal, the harder reading is to be preferred. The natural explanation of the LXX renderings is that the translators were puzzled by the archaic word Shaddai and avoided it by the substitution of something easy to understand. Dahse, however, prefers the easier reading for obvious reasons. Naville, we remember, does the same. But how then are we to account for the occurrence of the unusual Divine Name, El Shaddai, seven times in the Hebrew text? Here is

Dahse's explanation: (i) he reads El Shaddai in 49^{25}—no doubt correctly (see I 2 (*d*)), but in the other 6 passages he reads 'my (or 'thy' or 'their') God'; (ii) he brings in his 'Liturgical Editor' (Ezra), who, according to Dahse, divided the Pentateuch into 'Readings'! This Editor, it seems, wrote Ex. $6^{2ff.}$ himself as a sort of recapitulation of Ex. $3^{esp.\ 15ff.}$. This was originally placed in the margin for the use of the Reader, but it was soon inserted in the text. (iii) Ex. $6^{2.3}$, according to Dahse, originally ran: 'I am Yahweh and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, being their God, but my name * I did not make known to them.' But this production of the Liturgical Editor does not seem to have pleased the 'Theological Editor,' who came after him. Apparently this Editor thought the above to be very weak and colourless and so he substituted El Shaddai for 'being their God' and inserted Yahweh after 'my name.' This necessitated his going back to Genesis and inserting El Shaddai in the five passages already mentioned (I 2 (*d*)). Presumably he took the title from Gen. 49. He did not alter 26^{24} (the self-revelation to *Isaac*), because he only added names in Ezra's insertions (28^{3}, 35^{11}, 48^{3}) or at the beginning of a Reading (17^{1}, 43^{14})! He however made up for the omission in 26^{4} by inserting the name in Isaac's blessing of Jacob in 28^{3}. I use the word 'apparently' above, because Dahse himself gives no reason, and we are therefore left to grope about for some conceivable motive which could have led an Editor to make such an extraordinary series of changes.

* Yahweh is omitted here in 2 cursives of the LXX, 1 Eth. MS., citations by Justin, Philo and others. Dahse seizes upon this to throw doubt upon Yahweh being original even in Ezra's day and then, assuming that it is not original, to argue that therefore Ex. 6^{2-3} is a reference back to $3^{13\,ff.}$ The textual evidence is of the flimsiest; and, even if it were strong and the argument sound, what has Dahse gained? He has merely dated the revelation of the name Yahweh back a few weeks at the most, viz. to the revelation at the burning bush. He is no nearer to a proof of his own position. The name is still first revealed to Moses and not to the Fathers.

Could anything be more arbitrary and irrational than all this? Who would have thought of such a theory, if he had not been hard put to it to explain away the clear meaning of Ex. 6^3, as it stands in the Hebrew text? Moreover when could the Theological Editor have effected these changes? The Samaritan Pentateuch supports the Hebrew text in every case, and this carries back these readings at latest to the 4th century B.C., i.e. nearly 100 years before the LXX translation was made.

How refreshing to turn from the feeble version of Ex. 6^{2-3}, given us by Dahse and quoted above, so unworthy of the solemn occasion on which it is said to have been uttered, and read again the version of it, which we have given to us in our English Bible. After full consideration of all that has been said on the other side, we can only conclude that the Hebrew text on which the latter is based stands firm and unshaken.*

III. *Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, as built upon a precarious and shaky foundation.*

"The question," as Dr. Welch says (p. 346), "has been raised from two sides as to whether the differing use of the Divine Names, Yahweh or Elohim, forms a reliable basis for such an analysis."

1. Before measuring the force of these two types of criticism, it will be well to clear the ground by inquiring to what extent 'the differing use' referred to *is* to-day the basis for the analysis. Undoubtedly it was of inestim-

* For a full discussion of Dahse's theory of the text see Dr. Skinner's *The Divine Names in Genesis*, chap. i, and note on pp. 270–1. As for his theory that the usage of the Divine Names is largely determined by the Synagogue readings and that these were the work of Ezra, I do not know a single writer of repute who accepts it. His friend and ally, H. M. Wiener, himself rejects it and, as Prof. Welch well says (p. 348), it "has been fully, in my judgment conclusively, answered by Dr. Skinner" (see *The Divine Names*, chaps. ii–viii).

able value in the earlier stages of investigation, as setting students upon the track which led to the documents-hypothesis, but it has long ceased to be the sole basis. Present-day scholars with good reason believe in the substantial accuracy of the Hebrew text in regard to the Divine Names, but they do not think of denying that here and there in the course of transmission errors may have crept in, and they base their theory upon a much wider foundation. Dr. Welch acknowledges this. It is "perfectly true," he says, that "the whole question has now been shifted from so narrow a basis and has come to rest on a much wider foundation. Difference in language, difference in theological attitude, difference in moral and social outlook, have now come in to supplement and correct the original single test." But he offsets this acknowledgment by disparaging these other criteria as equally unreliable on the grounds that these are (*a*) in some cases 'subjective' in character and (*b*) in others absent or so uncertain and even contradictory that finally the critic has nothing but the use of the Divine Name on which to base his analysis (pp. 349 ff.).

A few words must be said on each of these two points.

(*a*) The charge of 'subjectivity.' This Dr. Welch speaks of as "the curse of *all* Old Testament criticism." It is not then in any way peculiar to any particular set of critics. And indeed nothing could be more clearly 'subjective' than Dr. Welch's argument with regard to the story of the Flood (pp. 350–1). It is none the worse for that. Subjectivity is all right, so long as it is a sane and healthy subjectivity. There is no need to regard it as a curse. Differences in theological and cultural outlook are real. Dr. Welch uses them effectively in his new book, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (e.g. pp. 58–9), and no critic need be ashamed to use such criteria. But there are other criteria

of a literary kind, which are not liable to this charge. Against them the Professor brings—

(*b*) the charge of inconclusiveness and uncertainty of import. It will be noted that the only examples given of this are 'the early stories of the period prior to the Flood.' It is quite true that in some of these, such as that of 'the Sons of God' in Gen. 6, literary criteria are less obvious and the theological outlook is not uniform, but that is only to be expected. The compiler incorporated these antique stories in his work with a minimum of change, the use of the name Yahweh being the clearest indication as to who was the compiler.* But in others, such as the two versions of the stories of Creation and the Flood, the phraseology and the details of the two presentations are markedly different and clearly differentiate the one from the other. As Dr. Welch says: 'P can be distinguished with ease' (p. 362). And after the first eleven chapters of Genesis, this charge has no longer any valid ground at all. It needs also to be pointed out that admittedly the criterion of the differing use of the Divine Names is no longer available once Ex. 6 has been reached, yet the analysis is able to separate P from JE from Ex. 7 onwards with as much practical certainty as before.

On p. 352 Dr. Welch asserts that "neither the use of the divine names nor the use of other criteria leads to sure results. And (he adds) when the insufficiency of the one method is pointed out, to seek refuge in the other is neither dignified nor convincing." I am sorry that he says this. There is no thought of 'seeking refuge.' The two methods have been in operation side by side from the days of Astruc and Eichhorn in the eighteenth century. When the evidence

* Dr. Welch speaks of Dr. Skinner as reviving 'the old exploded fragmentary theory' in his treatment of these stories. On this see Article 1, p. 13, footnote.

of one witness is questioned, it is plain common sense to point out that his evidence does not stand alone but is corroborated by that of others. I am sure that Dr. Welch would not rule out in similar terms those legal arguments, based on the cumulative force of a large number of pieces of circumstantial evidence, which are daily accepted in our Courts of Law.

2. Let us now consider the first of the two criticisms mentioned by Dr. Welch, leaving the second to be dealt with in the following Article. "A number of students, such as Möller,* have insisted that Yahweh and Elohim are not employed as synonyms in the Old Testament. Elohim is frequently employed where we should employ an adjective like divine; Yahweh, on the other hand, often carries the sense of the God of revelation. . . . Hence a work of Elohim may simply correspond to what we should call a divine work, while a work of Yahweh may mean what we should name specifically an act of God in revelation or even in redemption."

There are two forms of this argument. (i) Möller, Naville and W. H. Green,† for example, would apply this line of argument to the whole body of uses of the Divine Names. Elohim, wherever it is used, means the God of Creation; Yahweh always signifies the God of revelation. The same writer could therefore use both names and pass readily from one to the other according to the particular connotation with which he wished to use it. But if so the hypothesis of different authors restricted to the use of either the one or the other of the two names falls to the ground. The weakness of this line of argument is that it "suffers from what is," according to Dr. Welch, "the curse of all Old Testament criticism—the subjective character" of the

* *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung.*

† *The Unity of the Book of Genesis.* Scribners, New York, 1895.

reasoning. It is easy for anyone with a lively imagination, and a determination to make the evidence point one way, to find subjective reasons why the one or the other Divine Name was used in any particular place, but as soon as these reasons are subjected to an impartial scrutiny it is seen how futile they often are. Of course there are passages in which critics of all types are agreed in recognizing that one name is more appropriate than another. The documentary theory attributes Gen. 3 to J but in verses 1–5 (the conversation between the woman and the serpent) Elohim is used. So, in other passages, Elohim is used in connexion with those who are (or are supposed to be) outside the chosen line.* It must be remembered that while P and E were by their view prevented from using the name Yahweh in Genesis, J had no view to prevent his using Elohim. No critic therefore uses the Divine Names as a clue to analysis without discrimination. But as soon as this occasional use of Elohim in J is exceeded and the attempt made to find a significant meaning in every use of the Divine Names, the arbitrary character of the applications of the theory is clearly seen. Take, e.g., Prof. Green on Gen. 11^{27}–25^{11}.† "Throughout this section," he says, "the divine Names are used with evident discrimination. Jehovah is used in 12–16. Elohim does not occur till chap. 17, where it is found repeatedly and with the exception of ver. 1 exclusively." Why, we ask, is this change made in chap. 17? Is it not still Jehovah, who enters into covenant with Abraham? Is not this eminently a passage where the name of the God of revelation should be used? Yes, but, says Green, the fulfilment of the promise given twenty-four years before had been so long delayed that it

* E.g. 33^{5-11} (Esau), 39^{9} (spoken to Potiphar's wife), $43^{23, 29}$ (Joseph, as Egyptian governor, and his Egyptian servant), 44^{16} (Judah and Joseph as Egyptian governor).

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 151–4.

was necessary to emphasize the Divine omnipotence by using El Shaddai and Elohim! This section includes two narratives of Abraham's deceit with regard to Sarah. In chap. 12 Yahweh is the name used, but in chap. 20 it is Elohim. In the first passage Green says that it is "Jehovah, the God of the chosen race," who is appropriately named as guarding Sarai, Abram's wife, in Egypt. But, when he comes to the second, he says "Elohim is the proper word," because Abimelech was "a Gentile." Wasn't Pharaoh (chap. 12) also a Gentile? It is the same with the two narratives relating to Hagar and Ishmael. According to Green, in 21^{8-21} "Elohim is used throughout, because they are now finally severed from the family of Abraham; whereas in 16^{7-13}, while Hagar still belonged to the family, it is the angel of Jehovah who finds her and sends her back"! Green acknowledges that in 25^{11} "Jehovah would certainly have been appropriate here. And yet Elohim is appropriate likewise." It is evident that this critic would find appropriateness in almost any possible use of the Divine Names. Even if Dahse succeeded in proving that the Names were to be altered in a number of cases in conformity with the LXX text, his ingenuity (were he still living) would enable him to give equally good (or bad) reasons for these new uses as once for the old.

We may add that, even if he were able to do this, he would be only at the beginning of his task. He would still have to explain how it comes to pass that in the passages assigned by so many scholars to P the use of Elohim is accompanied invariably by other linguistic phenomena and by different conceptions of worship and of history.

(ii) I am sure that Dr. Welch would not approve of the arbitrary methods, of which specimens have just been given. When he says that "Elohim is frequently used where we should employ an adjective like divine" and

that "the contention can be supported by the differing use of the divine names in the later historical books," he may be referring to Baumgärtel's much more reasonable and scientific investigation of the uses of the Names outside the Pentateuch, of which some account was given in the supplementary note to Article 1. If readers followed that statement and accepted as correct the application of Baumgärtel's method to the Pentateuch, they will have realized that at the outside only 33 uses of Elohim in Gen. 1–Ex. 3^{15} are affected by such reasoning and that with regard to the majority of these there is no dispute. They have not been used by careful writers as marks of Elohistic authorship. But in any case, the utmost amount of change is to reduce the uses of Elohim, as a proper name and the equivalent of Yahweh in other passages, from 178 to 145, while the application of the same principles to Ex. 3^{16}–Deut. reduces similar uses of Elohim in those books from 61 to 22! The contrast between the use in Gen. 1–Ex. 3^{15} and that in Ex. 3^{16}–Deut. becomes not less but greater! As a matter of fact, whether Dr. Welch is referring to the lines of argument adopted in (i) or (ii) (he seems to me to mix up the two) he evidently does not regard this first method of attack as of much value. He speaks of the second method as raising "a much more serious objection." But at the same time he does use it. He writes: "If a writer was able to use Yahweh in the special sense and Elohim in the general sense, he *may* have used both names . . . and *may* have passed readily from one to the other. So soon however as this is recognized, the use of Yahweh or Elohim in *any* particular passage ceases to be a distinctive thing." * The point however is not what a writer *may*

* There are five 'mays' in eleven lines. And did Dr. Welch mean 'any particular passage' or 'some particular passages'? The latter is all that Baumgärtel would contend for.

have done, but what a writer *has* done. On that point Dr. Welch does not commit himself. He calls for "renewed, close and unprejudiced examination" both as "to the reliability of the MT in connexion with the employment of the divine names" and as "to the practice throughout the whole of Scripture in the use of the same names," * but meantime leaves his readers in a haze of uncertainty. May I in the most friendly spirit use his own words in regard to other critics and call this proceeding "neither dignified nor convincing." * The haze seems to me to be one which careful study of the actual usage of Genesis disperses. As we have seen, all critics realize that there are cases where Elohim is deliberately used by J, but in the vast majority of cases the use of the two names prior to Ex. 3, seems plainly attributable, not to the discriminating use of the names by one single writer, but to the different views of different writers as to the date at which the name Yahweh first became known to the people of Israel.

J. Battersby Harford.

SOME NOTES ON NAHUM I.–II. 3.

(*c*) The Acrostic Poem.

We now approach the most difficult question, and the one which has caused much discussion—the question whether the whole or any part of chapters i.–ii. 3 is an alphabetical or acrostic psalm.

Alphabetical psalms are a well-known phenomenon.

* Expositor, May, 1923, p. 352. The curious thing is that, although Welch refers, in a footnote to this paragraph, to Baumgärtel's pamphlet, p. 13 f., he seems not to have read to the end or else he would surely have told us that Baumgärtel had made the very examination which he speaks of as so needed and that, as the result, he had come definitely to the conclusion that "the MT *has* faithfully transmitted the divine names" (see Article 3, Part III 3 v, in October issue).

They include Psalms ix.–x., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxii., cxix., cxlv. Of these cxi., cxii., cxix. are perfect,[1] and xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxlv. nearly so with only an occasional letter missing or redundant. In Psalms ix.–x., which form really one psalm (see the LXX), the letters א to ט at the beginning and ק to ת at the end can be clearly discerned, but the part between does not reveal the other letters, and it is only by very violent means that the scheme can be carried through. The alphabetical psalms all have the same characteristics. They consist of general and often unconnected reflections and gnomic sayings, and, while there is a general idea underlying all, each stanza is complete in itself. In letters which have very few words we often find reason to conjecture that the thought was chosen to suit the letter. "The alphabetical order appears to have been sometimes adopted by poets as an artificial principle of arrangement when the subject was one of a general character that did not lend itself readily to logical development." [2] It was probably adopted also to assist the memory in the recitation of these psalms in liturgical services, for which their general character made them very suitable. Such psalms seldom contain allusions to particular individuals or occurrences, they are rather the vehicles of general truths.

Now the opening of Nahum appears to present all the features which have been indicated above as belonging to acrostic poems. Its general theme is the vengeance of God upon his enemies, but each of the stanzas is a separate aspect of this theme. There seems no allusion to any special event. The unequal length of the stanzas has led to the suggestion that there may have been editorial additions, but the point is not of much consequence. The

[1] So are Lam. i.–iv.; Prov. xxx. 10–31.
[2] Driver, *Introd.*, 9th Ed., p. 368.

indications of an alphabetical scheme are so clear that it is almost universally acknowledged even by conservative critics that chapter i. 2–8 there is part of an acrostic poem from א to כ inclusive.[1] Such a poem is not to be obtained without some textual changes, but they are not extensive, and some of them are required on general grounds of textual criticism apart from this special question. These changes, including those which are necessary to make the structure of the acrostic poem complete in verses 2–8, are indicated below.[2]

If we find in these verses a *portion* of an alphabetical psalm, what about the other portion? Many eminent scholars have attempted, have in fact been determined, to force the verses i. 9–ii. 3 into such a portion.[3] The

[1] Driver, *Introd.*, 9th Ed., 357; Kennedy in Hastings' *Dict.*, art. "Nahum"; Wellhausen, p. 159; Steuernagel's *Lehrbuch*, 631; Davidson (p. 19) is doubtful, but *seems* inclined to agree as far as letter ט, *v.* 7.

[2] These are: (*a*) For the ב verse, to begin the line with בסופה transferring יהוה to the end of the verse before. (*b*) To get a ד verse by finding a substitute for אמלל. Some change is really required here by the LXX, which translates the two occurrences of אמלל in this verse by different words: ὀλιγώθη 1°, ἐξελίπε 2°. The latter word is used for דַּלּוּ (Isa. xxxviii. 14), and this form may well be read here. (*c*) For the ז verse it is necessary to strike out לפני and to insert לפניו after יעמוד, which on the whole gives a better sense. (*d*) In the ט verse the LXX omit למעוז, substituting *τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτὸν* = לְקַוָּיו. This should be read and למעוז retained after it. (See Bickell, *Carmina V.T. met.* 212). (*e*) To get the י verse ו must be struck out. (*f*) The כ verse is difficult. For מכומה LXX have *τοὺς ἐπεγειρομένους* (Luc. εξεγ—). A, Θ and Σ support this reading, while Σ and Syriac read the text, of which however the meaning is not clear. We should read with some Hebrew MSS. (Ginsberg) בְּקָמָו, or perhaps מִתְקוֹמְמָיו as Psa. cxxxix. 21 (Wellhausen). The words בשטף עבר at the beginning will have to be removed to the end of the previous verse.

The words beginning stanzas will then be

כלה ותשא אל
זעמו בסופה
חמתו גואר
טוב דלו
ידע הרים

See Powys Smith, *Int. Crit. Com.*, Nahum, 287; Wellhausen, 160.

[3] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1890, p. 107; Bickell, *Carmina V.T. metrice*, 1882. (The writer has not access to his later tract, *Das Alphab.*

methods adopted are startling. Such transposition and dislocation, such emendation and cutting, such twisting and torturing can seldom have been applied to any text. They can only be described in the words of Pope:

> . . . "mince them all to bits;
> As erst Medea (cruel, so to save!)
> A new edition of old Æson gave;
> Let standard-authors, thus, like trophies borne,
> Appear more glorious as more hack'd and torn.
> And you, my critics! in the chequered shade,
> Admire new light thro' holes yourselves have made." [1]

In our opinion the result of these efforts is complete failure.[2] They are all different, indeed widely different from each other. In contrast to the general agreement in regard to verses 2–8 there is no sign and no likelihood of even approximate agreement between these critics, and there never can be. It is not by such methods that the text of ancient authors can be restored so as to win a general assent to the results. These critics are not seriously trying to find out the words the prophet wrote; they are simply amusing themselves with learned trifling, and criticizing the performances of others. They do not claim to have obtained any real results. Hoonacker [3] is very frank about it. "The avowal must be made that as regards the second part—from letter ב—we are most frequently reduced to *hazardous conjectures*, and that Bickell's restorations . . . have not always been very successful." And again: "It must be understood that this attempt has no pretension to be authoritative. It is *a pure hypothesis*, at least so far

Lied Nahum i. 2–ii. 3, 1894, and quotes his readings from Hoonacker's Com.); Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 3rd Ed., 1922; Happel, *Nahum*, 1902; v. Hoonacker, *Les douze petites prophètes*, 1908.

[1] *Dunciad*, iv. 120–6.

[2] "Dieser Versuch ist gänzlich mislungen" (Wellhausen). "Bedarf es für den Nachweis der weiteren Strophen doch gar zu gewagter Aenderungen" (Steuernagel).

[3] Comm., pp. 420, 422.

as regards the second part of the piece from the מ stanza." In view of such an avowal and of the utter unsoundness of the methods adopted it does not seem worth while to examine the whole of these schemes in detail.

There is, however, a more moderate scheme which seeks only to carry on the acrostic poem through the letters ל, מ and נ [1] which seems to invite examination. As a specimen we will see how the ל stanza is made up by the various critics who have attempted to restore it. They generally make the first line of the distich :

"He will not arise twice [Gunkel "before the time"] against his enemies." [2]

It is in the second line of the distich that the diversity comes in as follows :

Hoonacker—

"They will be eaten as stubble fully dry." [3]

Gunkel and Bickell—

"An end he is making as appointed" (Gunkel "for ever"). [4]

Happel—

"For though they be a thicket they shall be eaten." [5]

Powys-Smith—

"For even an end he is making." [6]

We ask, bewildered by these contradictory schemes, "What did *Nahum* write ?"

We now take the נ stanza, which, it seems to be agreed,

[1] Powys-Smith, *Int. Crit. Com.*, Nahum, 287 ; Nowack, "Nahum" in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* ; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, 1904, p. 304, takes the acrostic to ס, and Cornill (*Einleit.*, 7th Ed., 1913, p. 204) to ע.

[2] לֹא יָקוּם פַּעֲמַיִם [מפעם Gun.]
[3] אָכְלוּ כְקַשׁ יָבֵשׁ מָלֵא
[4] כָּלָה הוּא עֹשֶׂה כְמֹעֵד (לעד Gun.)
[5] כִּי עַד סְבָךְ אֻכָּלוּ
[6] כִּי עַד כָּלָה הוּא עֹשֶׂה

is to have only one line, whereas those before it are to have two.

Hoonacker—

"Thus saith Jahveh, ruling on high."[1]

Bickell and Powys-Smith—

"Jahveh takes vengeance on his enemies."[2]

Gunkel (who formerly despaired of making an ב verse) now offers:

"Accomplished are the days of my strife."[3]

Happel—

"They are cut off like many waters."[4]

Again we ask: Does any one really think that *Nahum* wrote any of these?

Surely this is enough of guessing and inventing. It is evident from these instances, which are a fair sample of the whole, that a second part of an acrostic poem cannot be found in the text. Instead of trying to put it there it will be more scientific to discuss the bearing of the existing phenomena rather than to invent others.

It has perhaps not received sufficient consideration that between i. 8 and i. 9 there is a startling change of topic, tone and style. Instead of the measured gravity and general truths of the alphabetical poem we are suddenly in the midst of fierce threats and invectives against persons and places. Some persons have devised plans against Jahveh who will make an utter end of them (*v.* 9). Some nation which was as strong as a tangled thorn hedge will be burned like dry stubble (*v.* 10).[5] Some city has sent

[1] נְאֻם יהוה מוֹשֵׁל מָרֹם

[2] נֹקֵם יהוה לְצָרָיו

[3] נִשְׁלְמוּ יְמֵי רִיבִי

[4] נִגְדְּרוּ כַּמַּיִם רַבִּים

[5] It seems impossible to restore a satisfactory text of this verse. Even the neat paraphrase of Sym.: ἀλλὰ ὁμοίως στοιβῇ συμπεπλεγμένη οὕτως καὶ τὸ

forth one devising plots against Jahveh counselling mischief (*v.* 11). They shall pass away and will not need a second stroke (*v.* 12). Some temple will be rifled ; some important person will be the last of his line (*v.* 14). Mingled with these furious denunciations are promises to Judah of a broken yoke (*v.* 13) and freedom from future invasions by a named enemy (*v.* 15). How utterly different are these utterances from the general propositions and grave theological propositions of *vv.* 2–8. These thoughts are too real and spontaneous, too expressive of personal hate and personal joy to be bound by the shackles of artificial verse. The material is too intractable for an acrostic. A writer animated by a fury of rage arising from a hundred years of wrongs is not likely to stop and look for the correct letter to begin his invective. Not only have the attempts made to give these verses the acrostic form failed up to the present, but they must always fail. The verses did not originally take, and were not capable of taking, so artificial a form.

If the alphabetical psalm stops at *v.* 8 the difficult question must arise, How is the form of chapters i.–ii. 3 to be explained? Wellhausen suggested that an editor of Nahum's book began to render it into acrostic form and stopped for some reason at *v.* 8. This ingenious theory has never found any acceptance—it is too unlikely. It has also been thought [1] that *vv.* i. 13, 15, ii. 1, the promises to the Jews, are later interpolations. We see no reason for this view—especially when it is remembered that Nahum lived in Judea. But it does seem likely that i. 13 is out of place between two threats addressed to the enemy, and that i. 13, 15 and ii. 2

συμπόσιον αὐτῶν συμπινόντων ἀλλήλοις, which is followed by Jerome, fails to give a good sense. The LXX and the Syr. reveal a wide divergence of text and give no help. The only course seems to be to omit the words וּכְסֻבָּאִם סְבוּאִים as corrupt and unintelligible and take the general sense of the rest. (See Wellhausen and Davidson *ad loc.*)

[1] Wellhausen, p. 160 ; Marti, p. 304 ; Davidson, pp. 29, 30.

may have originally stood together before ii. 1. The whole of the text i. 9–ii. 3 shows signs of confusion and corruption —especially *vv.* 10 and 12, where the LXX and Syriac read something widely different and the sense of the Hebrew is not clear. Some explanation of these phenomena is required. We venture to suggest the following solution.

It seems evident that the oracle of Nahum against Assyria and her king cannot have begun at i. 9 where we find ourselves suddenly introduced into the middle of a torrent of invective. Something must have gone before to explain what person or what locality is being addressed. What did *you* devise ?—Out of *thee* came one—If I afflict *thee*— That no more of *thy* name be sown—*Thy* gods—I will make *thy* grave—*Thou* art vile. These references must have been preceded by some sort of an exordium to make them intelligible and give them point. In view of this, and of the dislocation and confusion apparent in the text, we suggest that the opening part of the oracle—perhaps the first leaf of the MS.—has been lost. When it is considered through what shattering events Judah passed after its composition—Egyptian vassalage—Babylonian conquest—the fall of Jerusalem—exile—return to a ruined city and country —there was plenty of opportunity to lose a leaf of a roll. So when the men of the Great Synagogue, or whoever it was who compiled and edited the collection of the "twelve prophets," came to the roll of Nahum they would find it mutilated and deficient. How could it be provided with a suitable opening ? Among the fragments of sacred poems in their possession there was a portion of an acrostic Psalm, which being incomplete had never found a place in any of the collections ; neither in David's nor Asaph's nor Korah's sons', nor in that of the Precentor, and which had therefore no title.[1] This Psalm, whose topic was the vengeance of

[1] See Cannon, *The 68th Psalm*, pp. 4–5.

Jahveh on his enemies, seemed suitable to form an opening to Nahum's denunciations of the Assyrian king and city, and thus the book was made up in its present form. As the tradition of Nahum's residence at Elkosh in Judea would doubtless be known to these editors, it would be natural for them to prefix the double title explaining the contents of the roll and the name of its author. It is suggested by Cornill,[1] and is far from unlikely, that the editors in placing this Psalm at the beginning of the book were influenced by the fact that there was very little of the religious-prophetic element in Nahum and that the Psalm would supply it. It may be added that the fact that a passage occurs in a certain book is not to be regarded as a proof that it was looked upon by those who drew up the Canon as necessarily an integral portion of that book. For the custom was to insert shorter compositions into longer ones lest from their lack of bulk they should be lost.[2]

The solution we have suggested explains and accounts for all the difficulties and peculiarities of the text, and it does so without altering that text further than is required by the ordinary rules of textual criticism. We trust that this may be considered to be a sounder method than that of rewriting the text to fit the theory advocated, which, as experience abundantly proves, never results in agreement or settled conclusions.

W. W. Cannon.

[1] *Einleit.* 204.

[2] See Lowe, *Zechariah*, p. xvi. "Why was the book of Hosea not separated and placed first? Because his book is small, and if it were placed separately it would become lost" (Baba Bathra i. 5, trans. Rodkinson, v(xiii), p. 44.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON PROVERBS.

The collections of sayings which make up this book represent in their present form one of the most important sides of the life and thought of the post-exilic community. And there is no doubt that it is the post-exilic period on which our attention will be focussed more and more closely during the next twenty years. A number of converging lines of influence are tending in this direction. The study of comparative religion and cultural anthropology which is forcing us in spite of ourselves to examine the course of Hebrew and Jewish thought as one stream of religious development amongst others, and not as being unique in any *a priori* sense ; the realization that the dogmatic and intellectual New Judaism, and not the old instinctive semi-animism of the pre-exile, had held the field for four hundred years before Our Lord's appearance ; the growing tendency to attempt some explanation of the form and substance of Jesus' message by reference to his ethical and literary forbears ; the effort to treat the history of our faith on ordinary historical lines without falling back on distinctions between rational and revelational truth which the modern mind inevitably rejects : all these are bringing into increasing prominence the period immediately preceding the earthly life of Jesus himself. And Old Testament criticism confirms us by pointing in the same direction. If we regard the sixth century as marking the division between the fourth Semitic period and the Hellenistic period in Palestine—and we are forced to do so—it is clear that this archæological distinction corresponds to a real boundary between two waves of religious and social development. For one of the salient features of present-day criticism is its insistence on the fact that all the Old Testament literature has come down

to us through the hands of exilic editors—we have nothing which has not passed through the literary and theological sieves of the exile. And what is more, it becomes increasingly evident that the larger half of the Old Testament is actually post-exilic in origin, even though it may and often does depend on pre-exilic models and material. The Old Testament writings are continually tumbling over the barrier of the exile and rolling from the pre-exilic into the post-exilic period.

Now the lines of thought traceable throughout the post-exilic period are mainly four. We have the ritual and legal as represented by the pentateuchal codes; the devotional in the Psalms; the ethical humanism of the wisdom literature, which takes the place of philosophy; and lastly, the apocalyptic in the canonical book of Daniel and elsewhere. These four lines are not of course independent of each other. They intertwine and are interrelated in various ways. It is rather as if post-exilic thought was a building which could be approached and inspected from four sides. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson well says that the book of Leviticus and the Psalter must be read in parallel columns, and in fact there are four such columns, not two only. The Law, as both Psalms and Proverbs often insist, is designed to produce individual good conduct and piety, and thus social well-being:

> Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way?
> By taking heed unto Thy *law*.

and again:

> Whose delight is in the *law* of the Lord
> And in His *law* doth he meditate day and night.
> He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water.

The wisdom literature thus takes on for us, as expounders of the essentials of Christian thought, a fresh lease of living interest as representing the intellectual expression of the

faith and morals which characterized the religious ancestry of Our Lord Himself. And the book of Proverbs is the classical canonical example of that literature, both in its literary form and in its ethical substance. The question of literary form is of great importance, especially in its bearing on the form of the teaching of Jesus. It is true that this aspect of the Old Testament proverbs and the New Testament sayings is inevitably connected with linguistic study, and that anyone who stands in the position of a specialist in such studies is naturally diffident and reluctant to press the value of linguistic investigations on those who are doing the more important and practical work of the ministry and whose time is claimed by so many varying calls. It is obvious, however, that in the case of Proverbs, the original text has an exceptional value. Moreover, the proper appreciation of a good commentary almost requires a certain knowledge of Hebrew, and those fortunate enough to have acquired such knowledge will find an acquaintance with the late Dr. G. B. Gray's *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* of great use in estimating the attempts of commentators to amend doubtful passages ; the matter does not stop here, for as hinted above, some comprehension of Hebrew poetry in general and that of Proverbs in particular is of the greatest value when studying the Gospels. Many of the sayings of Jesus are cast in the same literary form as those in Proverbs.

Leaving now the question of form, let us take up that of historical background. Here a difficulty arises, because it will be immediately objected that no one knows exactly what this background was. Questions of origin are handled differently in different commentaries. A recent German book would persuade us of the Egyptian provenance of our Proverbs, whilst in the *Schweich Lectures* for 1921, Professor Margoliouth raises again the suggestion of Cheyne and others that we are to seek a South Arabian origin for at any rate

some parts of our book. Such considerations we may leave on one side. There can be little or no doubt that in its present form the book represents the best ethical thought of religious and cultured men in the post-exilic period, even if some or many of the sayings were originally pre-exilic and even non-Israelite. Thus it is necessary that we should study the history of this period, that is, not merely the political history, which is but the skeleton, but the whole period in its social and economic aspects. For this purpose the best books in English are perhaps L. E. Browne's *Early Judaism*, E. R. Bevan's *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, and for the end of the period R. T. Herford's *The Pharisees*, and I. Abrahams' *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. There is also a capital book by Professor A. Causse of Strasbourg, entitled *Les "Pauvres" d'Israël*, which throws a good deal of light on that distinction between "rich" and "poor", "good" and "wicked" men which is so constantly recurrent in Proverbs as well as in the Psalter. For a short handbook on the political history of the whole period Fairweather's *From Exile to Advent* gives the main facts, whilst for the general religious development the last chapters of K. Marti's *The Religion of the Old Testament* may be consulted. Kent and Riggs' *History of the Jewish People* gives a fuller account.

The articles on Wisdom and Proverbs in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* are by Siegfried and Nowack respectively and are well worth consulting. The corresponding articles in the *Encyc. Bibl.* are both by Toy. Cheyne's books *Job and Solomon* (1887) and *The Religious Life of Post-exilic Judaism* (1898) are still of value, and many will find help in W. A. L. Elmslie's *Studies in Life from Jewish Proverbs*, which is an excellent piece of work and perhaps the best general homiletic study of Proverbs now available in English. A similar book is W. T. Davison's *The Wisdom*

Literature of the Old Testament, which is much less detailed in its scope, though useful as far as it goes. Dillon's *Sceptics of the Old Testament* is useful for the Agur section, and is interesting and stimulating, but the portion dealing directly with Proverbs is very brief.

Coming now to the actual text it should be premised that no general study can take the place of close exegetical work on the book itself. This is especially true of Proverbs, where a single couplet must almost always provide the text for a homily. There is no immediate context here to assist the exegesis, and consequently this can only be secured by careful investigation of the meaning of each of the half-dozen or so Hebrew words involved. To take a block of narrative from Genesis or Samuel, a discourse from the Fourth Gospel, or a doctrinal paragraph from Paul, is one thing. In each case we have a great bunch of stuff which hangs together, and of which each part is more or less explained by the others. In Proverbs, on the other hand, with a few exceptions, like the poem on the origin of Wisdom in chapter viii., and that on the Virtuous Woman in chapter xxxi., each couplet or triplet contains a distinct thought, not directly related to the surrounding matter. Moreover, the Hebrew text is in many places obscure.[1] A good commentary is therefore essential. The best in English is the *Internat. Crit. Comm.* by C. H. Toy. Without being one of the most original or inspired of the series it is a good and thorough piece of work, if somewhat radical in its excisions. The critical notes are sound without being overloaded. Professor Toy's preconceived ideas of Hebrew prosody sometimes lead him to reject readings which may after all be correct, and it is just here that a previous study

[1] There is a German work on the LXX text of Proverbs by P. de Lagarde: *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien.* 1863.

of Dr. Gray's book on this subject, mentioned above, will prove valuable. Of the smaller commentaries that in the *Cambridge Bible* is by H. H. Perowne, that in the *Century Bible* by G. Currie Martin; both are useful and excellent pieces of work. The five principal German commentaries are respectively by Delitzsch (*Biblischer Comm.*, 1873), Strack (*Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, 1899), Nowack (*Kurzgef. exeget. Hndbuch*, 1883), Wildeboer (*Kurzer Hand-commentar*, 1897) and Frankenberg (*Handkommentar*, 1898), the youngest of which is, as will be noticed, nearly a generation old. The three latter are probably the most useful, though the works of Delitzsch and Strack have special interest for us owing to the profound knowledge of Babylonian and of Rabbinic Hebrew for which these scholars were respectively so justly celebrated. This point is not unimportant because it has yet to be seen how much light will be thrown on the book of Proverbs by Babylonian and Rabbinic literature, although it is of course true that in the former field constant fresh discoveries have already added vast stores to the material available fifty years ago, when Delitzsch published his commentary. At the same time we cannot afford to neglect anything which may throw light on the post-exilic mentality or its social and ethical environment. In this connexion the recent study by Rabbi Feldman, *Parables and Similes of the Rabbis*, though it suffers from lack of consecutive thought, is yet valuable as a storehouse of Rabbinic parallels to, and comments on, the canonical material, in this case with especial reference to nature similes. Professor Elmslie well says (*op. cit.*):

"The Hebrews were not unobservant of nature or unsympathetic, and the writers of the Old Testament make many allusions to the scenes and processes of the visible world, and they recognise its beauties and its marvels. The artist's proper quarrel with the Hebrews is that very seldom did they see nature in and for itself,

but almost always through the medium of its relationship to the mental or physical interests of man."

Many of the nature similes in Proverbs are paralleled in the Second Isaiah, and also in the other wisdom literature, canonical and uncanonical, as well as in the Gospels. One of the most beautiful of such similes is that found in the Hebrew text of Ben Sira:

> The hoar frost also he sprinkleth abroad like salt,
> And maketh the pine needles to sparkle as with jewels.
> (Ecclus. xliii. 19.)

Indeed the Hebrew genius for observation of nature is nowhere more evident than in the wisdom literature, and our book contains many beautiful examples of this. It is of course obvious that all students of Proverbs should also read carefully both Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom, and these may be best studied in Dr. Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, and in Peters' edition of the extant Hebrew text of the former.

The human interest mentioned by Professor Elmslie is no drawback to the expositor, but rather the contrary. And further. There are many sidelights in Proverbs on the domestic and general social life of the post-exile which have equally a bearing on our own times. The more we feel drawn to point out from the pulpit the social and even economic implications of our religious faith, the more shall we find inspiration in expounding passages from the wisdom literature. Here we find set out the views of post-exilic ethicists regarding the status of women and the proper view of marriage and of family life. Here, too, we find many shrewd remarks from which the opinions of the writers regarding personal responsibility, heredity and environment, the possibilities of education, and the proper places in our lives of reason and intellect on the one hand, of instinct and emotion on the other, can be deduced.

The theology of the post-exile is a fascinating study. How much it owed to Babylon, to Persia, and later to Hellas. it is difficult to say, and the study of origins may easily become a matter of sterile intellectual erudition. Nevertheless it is worth while to mention in this connexion J. H. Moulton's *Early Zoroastrianism*, and for Greek influence the last chapter of Dr. Abrahams' recent little book on *Judaism*. Dillon (*op. cit.*) thinks he can detect the influence of Indian philosophy in the Agur section, which Dr. Margoliouth inclines to think is Sabæan. The book of Proverbs, however, is best studied simply on the assumption of a post-exilic background adopted by most modern commentators. That the wise men were not unknown in the pre-exilic period is evident from Jeremiah xviii. 18, and from the collection of sayings of Aḥikar in the *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* collected by Dr. Cowley, which are certainly a translation from an earlier (perhaps Babylonian) collection. Nevertheless our proverbs have been adjusted to the post-exilic point of view, and some were doubtless composed in that period. A careful study of the whole anthology does much to fill out our picture of the life of that community, even though we cannot date exactly any one particular saying.

Lastly, we should like to call attention to an interesting work on the text of Proverbs which is shortly to be published by Canon Melville Scott. The author has made therein a number of interesting suggestions as to possible emendations, and some of these are of considerable homiletic importance. We quote by his kind permission an outstanding example, Proverbs xviii. 4, where by a simple emendation the difficult couplet incorrectly and unjustifiably rendered in the Authorised Version :

> The words of a man's mouth *are as* deep waters,
> And the wellspring of wisdom *as* a flowing brook.

becomes :

> The words of an oracle are a deep pool;
> The fountain of wisdom is a flowing stream.[1]

which surely gives material for a powerful sermon on the difference between magic and personal religion, between the dark overhung, stagnant pool of hypnotism and fetish-worship, and the fresh sparkling stream of thought and love which is the outpouring of God's guidance revealed through generous and intelligent human minds. We quote this as a single instance of the results obtained from a detailed exegetical study of Proverbs. The interpretation above suggested is by no means forced or read into the text. It is simply the correct exegesis of this after acute though simple emendation proceeding upon principles applied to many other passages. This particular emendation is in line with the general teaching of Proverbs, which is a plea for rational and ethical religion, and is thus essentially Protestant. The writers believe in the value of pious and intelligent personalities and are in thorough accord with the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians xiv. They, too, had rather speak five words with their understanding than babble ten thousand in an unknown tongue. They are as far as possible from agreeing with Otto that the only common measure of religious experience is irrational awe, or from exalting instinct at the expense of intelligence, and for this reason alone the book of Proverbs deserves to be studied afresh at the present moment.

JOHN P. NAISH.

[1] I.e. מים עמקים דברי משא : נחל נֹבֵעַ מקור חכמה

THE END OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK.

A Suggestion.

The Gospel of St. Mark ends abruptly at xvi. 8, so abruptly that it is evident that the original ending is missing. Is it quite certain that no trace of the original ending is now discoverable ?

In the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the Revised Version and Westcott and Hort print verse 6 as the beginning of a fresh paragraph. The reason for this is plain. There is, at that point, a quite perceptible jolt in the narrative. The " gathering together " of Jesus and the disciples has been described in verse 4, and there seems no very obvious reason for describing it again in verse 6. Moreover the whole passage 6–11, which is printed as a single paragraph in the Revised Version, is an amplification of what has gone before. The meeting (4), the Ascension (2), the Instruction (2, 3), have all been summarily dealt with. The paragraph (6–11) adds details, but no new fact.

More than this, it is a complete whole, and can even be removed without spoiling the continuity of the story, which then reads thus : " The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up, after that he had given commandment through the Holy Ghost unto the apostles whom he had chosen : to whom he also showed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God : and, being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me ; for John indeed baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost

not many days hence. Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is nigh unto Jerusalem, a sabbath day's journey off." (Acts i. 1–5 and 12.)

The paragraph (6–11) might be described as interrupting the narrative in order to enrich it; as if the author had found a piece of information which exactly suited his purpose and had woven it into his story. If this was so where could he have found it? Before we attempt to answer this question we must look attentively at the paragraph itself.

On a careful reading two features will be found to arrest attention. The first is in the famous plan of campaign. "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (ver. 8). Why is Galilee omitted? It is not the case elsewhere. The original work of evangelization is described as "beginning from Galilee" (Acts x. 37; cf. Luke xvii. 11, xxiii. 5): and when at a notable moment in the story of the sequel the writer pauses to take breath and look round his summary runs, "so the Church throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria had peace" (Acts ix. 31). Is there any reason for its omission in verse 8? On the surface of the narrative, none at all. But what if, in its original context, the scene were Galilee instead of the neighbourhood of Jerusalem? The work of evangelization had been very thoroughly carried out by Jesus and the whole company in Galilee, according to the synoptic narrative. It was only in the fateful city of Jerusalem that it had been checked by the arrest and crucifixion of the Leader. If a new start was to be made now, the starting-point would naturally be Jerusalem, not Galilee. If the original scene of verses 6–11 was Galilee, the omission of Galilee in verse 8 and the naming of Jerusalem as the first field of the new mission would be quite natural.

The second point to be noticed is in the speech of the "two men" (verse 11). Here it is a little, though only a little, curious that the Apostles should be addressed as "Ye men of Galilee." In the story of the betrayal (Luke xxii. 59) and in the astonished exclamations of the crowds on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 7) it is quite natural that Peter and the Apostles should be called Galilæans. Their dialect betrayed them. Here, however, they are not speaking, but tensely silent. It is for this reason that the form of address is curious. But if the scene were Galilee it would be natural, as natural as Peter's "Men of Judæa" to the mixed assembly in Jerusalem in Acts ii. 14.

With the possibility of a Galilæan milieu in view we turn to the end of the Synoptic narratives. Luke's is complete and the scene never shifts from Judæa. Matthew's is complete, but the scene ends in Galilee. Mark's is broken off, and though the scene has not yet moved from Jerusalem, a meeting in Galilee is already full in view. "But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you" (Mark xvi. 7).

It is very generally agreed that Luke uses the Gospel of St. Mark as one of his sources in writing his Gospel (for details see Harnack, *Luke the Physician*. English translation, pp. 87 to 93, and Streeter in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 674). Professor Burkitt writes: "The Gospel of Luke is very far from being 'a second edition of Mark revised and enlarged,' as I have elsewhere ventured to call the Gospel of Matthew. Luke is a fresh historical work, in which the Marcan thread is often dropped, and bits of Mark are ingeniously fitted into the Lukan scheme by alterations and omissions which would have made their original setting unrecognisable, were it not for the fact that the original is still extant." (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Foakes Jackson, and Lake, vol. ii. p. 107.)

Is it possible that in Acts i. 6–11 Luke is using a Marcan source ? In other words, have we here a part of the lost ending of Mark in a Lucan dress ? If this were the case, it is practically certain that the scene in the original would have been Galilee ; and, as we have seen, this would explain the omission of Galilee in verse 8, the words " men of Galilee " in verse 11, and the meeting described in verse 6, which as it stands is such an awkward sequel to verse 4. It would read :

" But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee : there shall ye see him as he said unto you." (Here would follow the description of the women's terror, with which Mark ends ; and their recovery and the delivery of their message, etc., which we must supply from Matthew xxviii. 5–10. But cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 351–360.)

" They therefore, when they were come together, asked him, saying, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you : and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel ; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven ? This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." (Mark xvi. 7, Acts i. 6–11.)

There is only one direction in which we can now look for further light on the question. That is an examination

of the text, to see if there are any traces of Marcan words in the passge.

(*a*) It is of course beyond question that in its present form it is Lucan. It is enough to cite such Lucan words as Asked (*ἠρώτων*) verse 6. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 16. *πρός* (used of speaking to), *H. S.*, p. 36. Times (*χρόνους*), *H. S.*, p. 22, ver. 7. Taken up (*ἐπήρθη*), ver. 9, *H. S.*, p. 16. *καὶ*, in apodosis, *H. S.*, p. 16. Men (*ἄνδρες*), *H. S.*, p. 14. "Looking steadfastly" (*ἀτενίζοντες*), *H. S.*, p. 143, ver. 10.

(*b*) But this is not all that is to be said. There are Lucan words in the passage which in the Gospel are renderings of different words in Mark.

Jerusalem. *Ἱερουσαλήμ* is Luke's favourite form of the word; though, as verse 4 reminds us, not his universal usage. The evidence is conveniently summarised in Harnack, *Acts of the Apostles*, English Translation p. 77.

Mark's usage is invariably *Ἱεροσόλυμα*. But twice over in the Gospels Mark's *Ἱεροσόλυμα* (iii. 8, x. 32) becomes *Ἱερουσαλήμ* in Luke (vi. 17, xviii. 31).

ἀτενίζω is Lucan. But in Luke xxii. 56 *ἀτενίσασα* is Lucan for Mark's *ἐμβλέψασα* (xiv. 67).

Apparel (*ἐσθήσεσι*), verse 10, is a rare word occurring here and in Luke xxiv. 4, where *ἐσθῆτι* is Lucan for Mark's *στολὴν* (xvi. 5). It is worth adding that in the same passage Mark's *νεανίσκος* represents Luke's *ἄνδρες δύο*, one of the Lucan phrases in Acts i. 6–11.

Thus none of this group of Lucan words can be used to rule out a possible Marcan original.

(*c*) Two other non-Marcan words are read differently in the "eccentric" Bezan text (D). They are "asked" *ἠρώτων* (ver. 6) and "taken up" *ἐπήρθη* (ver. 9). For the first D reads *ἐπηρώτων*, a word of which Hawkins says it deserves consideration as being characteristic of Mark

(H. S., p. 12; cf. Swete, *St. Mark*, page xlix). For the second D reads *ἀπαρθῇ*, a word used by all three evangelists in the striking passage Luke v. 35, Mark ii. 20, Matthew ix. 15. Thus twice over in this passage D suggests a reading which would bring Mark into the picture.

(*d*) There is another group of words which might be classified as having a Marcan flavour:

White (*λευκαῖς*) in verse 10 is used twice in the Gospels by Mark (ix. 3, xvi. 5) as against Luke's once (ix. 29).

Kingdom (*βασιλεία*), verse 6, in the secular sense appears in Mark vi. 23, xi. 10 where Mark stands alone.

Were come together (*συνελθόντες*), verse 6, is common in Acts, but in the synoptists appears in Mark iii. 20 (vi. 33, Rec.), xiv. 53 as against Luke v. 15.

Authority (*ἐξουσία*), verse 7, is classed by Dr. Swete (*Mark*, p. xlix) as Marcan, under the heading "relatively frequent use of certain characteristic words."

A definitely Marcan trait is found in "stood by" *παριστήκεισαν*, which Hawkins groups with characteristically Marcan words (*H. S.*, p. 29).

Dr. Swete notes as characteristics of Mark, the use of *εἶναι* with a participle (p. xlvii.) and the multiplication of participles (p. xlviii.): an example of each is to be found in *ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν*, verse 10, and *καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη*, verse 9.

Evidence from language is precarious. But it is possible to detect hints of a Marcan original in this passage of Acts.

Putting all these facts together, the individuality of the passage Acts i. 6–11, its somewhat imperfect adhesion to its present context, the possibility of a scene in Galilee, the certainty that the scene of the end of Mark must have been Galilee, the traces of Marcan language, it seems fair to suggest that the passage is in fact a Lucan revision of some of the verses now missing at the end of Mark.

H. E. H. Probyn.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

III

viii. 1. *Knowledge puffeth up.*

"It is merely the quality of knowledge, which, be it in quantity more or less, if it be taken without the true corrective thereof, hath in it some nature of venom or malignity, and some effects of that venom, which is ventosity or swelling. This corrective spice, the mixture whereof maketh knowledge so sovereign is charity, which the Apostle immediately addeth to the former clause: for so he saith, *knowledge bloweth up, but charity buildeth up;* not unlike unto that which he delivereth in another place: *If I spake*, saith he, *with the tongues of men and angels, and had not charity, it were but as a tinkling cymbal*; not but that it is an excellent thing to speak with the tongues of men and angels, but because, if it be severed from charity, and not referred to the good of men and mankind, it hath rather a sounding and unworthy glory, than a meriting and substantial virtue."

Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning* (i. 1. 3).

"But after reading these writings of the Platonists, and being admonished by them to seek incorporeal truth, I caught sight of Thine invisible things. . . . I became convinced that Thou art and art infinite, yet not diffused over space finite or infinite, and that Thou art truly what Thou hast ever been, the Same, unvarying in part or motion, and that all other things are from Thee, on the sole and fixed ground that they exist. Of all this I was convinced, but still too weak to enjoy Thee. I chattered away as if I were an expert, but if I had not sought Thy way in Christ our Saviour, I would have been not skilled but killed. I had begun to desire the appearance of being wise; I was filled with my own punishment, but I had no tears for that; I rather grew puffed up with knowledge. For where was the love that builds on the foundation of humility which is Christ Jesus? Or when would these writings have taught me that?"

Augustine's *Confessions* (vii. 20).

Froude, in his essay on the Oxford Counter-Reformation, observes that "the knot of followers who specially attached

themselves to him [Keble] show traces of his influence in a disposition not only to think the views they hold sound in themselves, but to regard those who think differently as their intellectual inferiors."

Speaking of his studies in Plato, Virgil, and Marcus Aurelius, F. W. H. Myers confesses, "The classics might aid imaginative impulse and detachment from sordid interests, but they had no check for pride. The Hellenism of very early years was an intellectual stimulus, but in no way a moral control. Entirely congenial to my temperament, it urged me onwards (as I have said) into intellectual freedom and emotional vividness, but exercised no check on pride."

"I may have given the impression that I take the metaphysician to be initiated into something far higher than what the common herd possesses. Such a doctrine would rest on a most deplorable error, the superstition that the mere intellect is the highest side of our nature, and the false idea that in the intellectual world work done on the higher subjects is for that reason higher work. Certainly the life of one man, in comparison with another, may be fuller of the Divine, or again may realize it with an intenser consciousness; but there is no calling or pursuit which is a private road to the Deity. And assuredly the way through speculation upon ultimate truths, though distinct and legitimate, is not superior to others. There is no sin, however prone to it the philosopher may be, which philosophy can justify so little as spiritual pride."

F. H. Bradley, *Appearance and Reality* (pp. 6–7).

viii. 9. *Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.*

"A man's worst difficulties," said Huxley, "begin when he is able to do as he likes." "'As you like' is a bad finger-post" (George Eliot).

"He would debate the right and wrong of anything, everything, and the rights and wrongs of men in every relation of life. Thus spake the curé to himself as he sat at solitaire under his orange-tree one afternoon: 'There will be no peace for him, no sweetness of nature, no green pastures and still waters, within or without, while he seeks life's adjustments through definitions of mere right and rights. No, boy; you will ever be a restless captive,

pacing round and round those limits of your enclosure. Worse still if you seek those definitions only to justify your over-riding of another's happiness in pursuit of your own.' "

G. W. Cable, *Bonaventure* (ch. vi.).

Amyas Leigh, says Kingsley, in the first chapter of *Westward Ho!*, believed it " to be the finest thing in the world to be a gentleman ; by which word he had been taught to understand the careful habit of causing needless pain to no human being, poor or rich, and of taking pride in giving up his own pleasure for the sake of those who were weaker than himself."

ix. 3. *My defence to them that examine me is this.*

During the dark days of 1836, when the temporary failure of the revolution in Italy stirred criticism of its leaders, Mazzini writes : " Even at that time the adverse opinion of the majority was a matter of little moment to me ; but to see myself suspected of ambition or any other than noble motives by the one or two beings upon whom I had concentrated my whole power of attachment, prostrated my spirit in deep despair."

ix. 7. *What soldier ever serveth at his own charges ?*

In his letter to the Speaker from Ireland (February 15, 1650), Cromwell thus appeals for the proper maintenance of the army : " Sir, I desire the charge of England as to this War may be abated as much as may be, and as we know you do desire, out of your care to the Commonwealth. But if you expect your work to be done, if the marching army be not constantly paid, and the course taken that hath been humbly represented,—indeed it will not be for the thrift of England, as far as England is concerned in the speedy reduction of Ireland. If the active force be not maintained, and all contingencies defrayed, how can you expect but to have a lingering business of it ? Surely we desire not to spend a shilling of your treasury, wherein our consciences do not prompt us. We serve you ; we are willing to be out of [done with] our trade of war ; and shall hasten, by God's assistance and grace, to the end of our work, as the labourer doth to be at his rest. This makes us bold to be earnest with you for the necessary supplies :—that of money is one."

ix. 10. *He that ploweth should plow in hope.*

In his life of Archbishop Temple (*Frederick Temple : An*

Appreciation, pp. 181, 182), Archdeacon E. G. Sandford observes that Dr. Goulburn, when head master of Rugby, "simply went on his way, trying to do his duty by the school, and, above all, to make his boys good Christians. He was content to regard himself as something of a failure ('I do not understand boys,' he said, though he understood them better than he fancied, and left unforgotten memories in the minds of many of them); and when he thought the time was come, he resigned, leaving it to others to tend the seed which he had sown, to widen the field and gather the harvest. Perhaps he did not understand all that was required of a husbandman, and did not always 'sow in hope'; but the school had not lost hope, it knew that there was good stuff in it—it was waiting for what was to come."

ix. 16. *Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel.*

When Dr. Donne's wife died, in 1617, he was overwhelmed with grief. "It took so full a possession of his heart, as to leave no place for joy; if it did, it was a joy to be alone. . . . And thus he continued," says Izaak Walton, "till a consideration of his new engagements to God, and St. Paul's *Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel*, dispersed those sad clouds that had then benighted his hopes, and now forced him to behold the light."

"Duties are not voluntary. Duty and will are even contradictory terms."

Burke, *Appeal from Old to New Whigs.*

"We have natures who not only are prompt in acknowledging claims upon them, who would fast and starve rather than withhold payment when due, but who perceive debts and duties which neither society nor individuals exact from them; who willingly offend the world, and, with open eyes, face its anger and resentment, so they may render it a service which no other is ready to offer. The saints, martyrs, and heroes have been of this type."

J. Cotter Morrison, *The Service of Man* (ch. ix.).

When Bishop Butler told Wesley that he was "not commissioned to preach in this diocese" of Bristol, Wesley answered, "My Lord, my business on earth is to do what good I can. Wherever therefore I think I can do most good, there must I

stay, so long as I think so. At present I think I can do most good here ; therefore, here I stay. As to my preaching here, a dispensation of the Gospel is committed to me ; and woe is me if I preach not the Gospel, wherever I am in the habitable world."

ix. 22. *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*

In a letter from Eversley, Kingsley declares : " I see no inconsistency in making my sermons while I am cutting wood ; and ' bizarrie ' in talking one moment to one man about the points of a horse, and the next moment to another about the mercy of God to sinners. I try to catch men by their leading ideas, and so draw them off insensibly to my leading idea. . . . So I am trying to become (harmoniously and consistently) all things to all men, and I thank God for the versatile mind He has given me."

" We quote St. Paul when he talked of making himself all things to all men, and of becoming to the Jews a Jew and as without the Law to the heathen. But then we do so with a view to justifying ourselves for leaving the Jew to remain a Jew, and the heathen to remain heathen. . . . There is, as anybody can see, a whole world of difference between the reserve of sagacious apostleship, on the one hand, dealing tenderly with scruple and fearfulness and fine sensibility of conscience, and the reserve of intellectual cowardice on the other hand, dealing hypocritically with narrow minds in the supposed interests of social peace and quietness."

Morley, *On Compromise* (ch. iii).

" I confess," says Carlyle, " I have no notion of a truly great man that could not be *all* sorts of men."

In his *Miscellanies* Charles Kingsley speaks of the duty of a poet " who desires honestly to proclaim great truths. If he has to offend the prejudices of the world in important things, that is all the more reason for his bowing to those prejudices in little things, and being content to be like his neighbours in outward matters, in order that he may make them like himself in inward ones. Shall such a man dare to hinder his own message, to drive away the very hearers to whom he believes himself to be sent, for the sake of his own nerves, laziness, antipathies, much more of his own vanity and pride ? If he does so, he is unfaithful to

that very genius on which he prides himself. He denies its divinity, by treating it as his own possession, to be displayed or hidden as he chooses, for his own enjoyment, his own glorification. Well for such a man, if a day comes to him in which he will look back with shame and self-reproach, not merely on every scandal which he may have caused by breaking the moral and social laws of humanity, by neglecting to restrain his appetites, pay his bills, and keep his engagements ; but also on every conceited word and look, every *gaucherie* and rudeness, every self-indulgent moroseness and fastidiousness, as sins against the sacred charge which has been committed to him ; and determine with that Jew of old, who, to judge from his letter to Philemon, was one of the most perfect gentlemen of God's making who ever walked this earth, to become 'all things to all men, if by any means he may save some.'"

ix. 25. *They do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible.*

"A tincture of asceticism in the Lacedæmonian rule may remind us again of the monasticism of the Middle Ages. But then, monastic severity was for the purging of a troubled conscience, or for the hope of an immense prize, neither of which conditions is to be supposed here. In fact, the surprise of Saint Paul, as a practical man, at the slightness of the reward for which a Greek spent himself, natural as it is about all pagan perfection, is especially applicable about these Lacedæmonians, who indeed had actually invented that so 'corruptible' and essentially worthless parsley crown in place of the more tangible prizes of an earlier age. Strange people!"

Pater, *Plato and Platonism* (ch. viii).

ix. 27. *I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection ; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.*

"Ah yes! all preciousness
To mortal hearts is guarded by a fear.
All love fears loss, and most that loss supreme,
Its own perfection."

George Eliot.

"The grey-haired saint may fail at last,
The surest guide a wanderer prove;
Death only binds us fast
To the bright shore of love."

Keble.

x. 2. *They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.*

"'They were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea'; this is the register of all Christ's chosen ones. . . . Do not trials and sorrows (also, it is true, deep joys) shared between two friends, partings, dangers, above all the having stood together in the presence of death, deepen the channel of our affection in deepening that of our existence? Are not such moments sacramental, bringing us nearer each other in bringing us nearer God?"

Dora Greenwell, *The Patience of Hope*, pp. 19–20.

x. 6. *Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.*

"A man seeing a wasp creeping into a vial filled with honey that was hung on a fruit tree, said thus: 'Why, thou sottish animal, art thou mad to go into the vial, when you see many hundred of your kind dying before you'? 'The reproach is just,' answered the wasp, 'but not from you men, who are so far from taking example by other people's follies that you will not take warning from your own.'"

Swift.

"We live more by example than by precept."

Selden.

x. 13. *There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to men.*

"Faith must be tried, and of all graces it is most suited unto trial."

John Owen.

x. 14, 15. *Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.*

"When we go wrong," said Goethe, "it is not our senses that are at fault, but our judgment."

"The world," said Shenstone, "may be divided into people that read, people that write, people that think, and foxhunters."

x. 23. *All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not.*

"Respect for character . . . not merely forbids us to injure our neighbour or to do anything that will interfere with his free development, but also positively bids us observe, as far as we can, what will further him. It was of this commandment that St. Paul was thinking when he said, 'All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient' . . . To partake of certain meats would not interfere either with the life or with the freedom of anyone; but, having regard to the stage of development at which they stand, we may be aware that it would be injurious to them. . . . The simplest way of summing up this commandment is perhaps to say, in Hegel's language, 'Be a person, and respect others as persons.'"

J. S. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics* (pp. 317, 318).

x. 25. *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience' sake.*

This may be termed, says Jowett, "the rule of Christian prudence. Buy food as other men do; perhaps what you purchase has come from the idol's temple, perhaps not. Do not encourage your conscience in raising scruples, life will become impossible if you do. In general we should be suspicious of any conscientious scruples in which other good men do not share. We shall do right to make a large allowance for the perplexities and entanglement of human things; we shall observe that persons of strong mind and will brush away all scruples; we shall consider that not he who has most, but he who has fewest scruples approaches most nearly the true Christian."

A GREAT BOOK ON PRAYER.[1]

THIS is one of the two books, which were named by Professor Adolf Deissmann, when he was lecturing in England, as being the most important religious books that have been published for a generation. The other book was Otto's

[1] *Das Gebet.* Eine religionsgeschichtliche und religionspsychologische Untersuchung, von Friedrich Heiler. München, 1923. Verlag von Ernst Reinhardt. 14 marks.

Das Heilige, which has already been translated, and widely discussed in this country, as well as abroad. Heiler's book is much larger than Otto's. It contains 500 pages, and there are in addition 125 pages of notes, bibliography and appendix. These 125 pages are both interesting and valuable. Practically every quotation in the text (and their name is legion) is provided with a reference ; every foreign quotation is translated ; and the index is good. The seven closely-packed pages of bibliography contain such an amount of cognate literature as almost to defeat their own end.

Voluminous as it is, the book does not profess to exhaust its subject. Heiler avowedly omits and reserves for future treatment both the larger philosophical questions and the narrower apologetic questions involved. Prayer, like religion, may be rational or it may not—Heiler maintains it is irrational—but there it is, and there it has always been ; and the professed aim of the book is to inquire into the essential nature and the universal qualities of prayer in its historical and psychological aspects, not in its philosophical and apologetic bearings. It is a book that, with its abundant quotations from missionary experience, saints, poets, artists and soldiers, would have delighted the heart of Dr. Alexander Whyte. The world's literature, ancient and modern, has been ransacked, and we have certainly never seen a book, in which such a wealth of experimental theology or personal religion has been gathered together.

" Praying is a queer business " ; thus the Preface opens. In all the wide realm of religion and piety there is no stranger or more wonderful phenomenon than prayer. To the religious mind, prayer is the most natural and the most necessary expression of religious life, the Alpha and Omega of piety, the source of all moral strength and spiritual joy. To the modern mind, saturated with the ideas of Natural

Science and philosophic criticism, prayer is a foolish and childish superstition, born of ignorance of the strict workings of natural law; it is the expression of low, selfish desire, a superstition which the morally strong man has overcome. "He who has already made progress in the Good, ceases to pray," said the philosopher of Königsberg. Prayer, therefore, is that religious phenomenon which marks the point where men diverge, the point where yawns the gulf between living piety and modern thinking.

Heiler repeats Professor Deissmann's own complaint, that this religious phenomenon, admitted by all religious men to be the central phenomenon of religion and the hearthstone of piety, has never yet been systematically studied: that, while much has been written about the meaning of the "Son of Man," little has been written about the prayers of Jesus: that, while numerous books have appeared dealing with what the great church Fathers thought, and what the great Reformers said, in their disputes about the One Triune God, about Grace, Redemption, Justification, Church and Sacraments, the literature is scanty that deals with these men's own faith and their own prayers; that, compared with the attention that has been given to the discussions of Councils and Papal Bulls, to controversies concerning State and Church, to the origin and conflicts of sects, and to questions about rites and liturgies, few writers have dealt with the prayers of the great saints and the prayers of the common people. Even modern religious literature deals more with religious ideas and customs, documents and ceremonies, than with religious life itself, which consists, not in thoughts about God and the future, but in communion with God. As the French psychologist, Da Costa Guimaraens, says: "Prayer is so human and common, that it is amazing to find that it is not even mentioned in our psychological textbooks." Tylor, the anthropologist, says: "The

nature of prayer is so simple and well known, that its study does not call for such a large number of facts and arguments as must be used in connection with rites that are, in comparison, far less significant." And even in the Burnett Lectures of Robertson Smith on the "*Religion of the Semites*," that pioneer investigation into the nature of Sacrifice, there is not one single section on Prayer—the index to these lectures does not contain either of the words "pray" or "prayer." Among all the literature that was published in connection with the anniversary of the Reformation in Germany, only one small book appeared dealing with Luther's prayers! Few students of religion have sought to penetrate into this holy of holies—few even seem to have any conception of the marvels that take place there!

Heiler's book is at once a study of the history and an investigation into the psychology of prayer. On the historical side, it deals with prayer as it has appeared and appears among primitive peoples—and here a large missionary literature has been laid under contribution—among the cultured Greeks, in the heart of uncivilized man and in that of the religious genius, in personal piety and in institutional religion, Catholic and Protestant, in private retirement and in public worship. On the psychological side, prayer, Heiler says, is prayer, wherever it is met with. Its externals may change, its attitudes, gestures, forms and modes of expression may vary. Its content may be worthy or ignoble; it may be selfish, material, frankly eudæmonistic, or refined, ethical, spiritual. But everywhere and always it involves the same psychological postulates. The prayers of the uncivilized man have their *counterpart* in the prayers of the saint and of the religious genius. Prayer has its origin in human emotions and desires, in the sense of need, and it involves a conception of God and of man's relation to God. Prayer, even in the primitive man, is the direct utterance

of profound psychical experiences ; it is the spontaneous outcome of a sense of need or of gratitude, finding utterance in unpremeditated words of plaint or praise or thanksgiving or petition. The joy of life, the longing for the expansion and enrichment of life, and the healthy will to live, which animate every human heart, nowhere find so pure and strong expression as in prayer. Ideals, of course, vary. It is life and safety and wealth, that the primitive man seeks from his god, his fetish, his totem, his idol. The ideals and desires of the saint, the prophet, the painter, the poet, may differ widely from these, but the same inner structure is common to all prayer.

Interesting illustration of this is found in the fact that the original terminology of prayer is with us still. Even if the things implied have been altered or purified, the original sensuous realism of primitive prayer is still found in our current speech. We " cry " or " call " on God : primitive man always prayed loudly, in order that his god might hear and heed him. We " run " to God : primitive man *ran* to the place where his god dwelt. We " come before " God in prayer : primitive man was fully persuaded of the sensuous presence of his deity. We " cast ourselves down " before God : primitive man literally cast himself to the dust. The original ideas and attitudes of prayer still survive in our own pious metaphors.

In times of spiritual declension this naïve praying sinks into fixed forms, thoughtlessly recited, and is confined to stated times and seasons. This happened too with uncivilised man. Among them also, when such ritualism and formalism increase, spontaneous, free prayer on the part of the individual is pushed into the background. A man feels that he has done enough when he has gone through the traditional rites. Finding himself beset by some great need, he comes to his priest, that he may choose an effective

formula, or specially persuasive words. Religious life is repressed and stifled; the spontaneous utterances of the religious consciousness are reduced to a minimum.

Of the postulates of prayer, those which influence it most powerfully are, says Heiler, the conception of God and that of man's relation to God. Put in this way, it sounds like a commonplace, but Heiler uses it as a standpoint from which to estimate the strength and weakness of the historical religions. Here, of course, the examples and illustrations given are specially valuable. The influence exerted on prayer by the various and varying conceptions of deity, polytheistic, anthropomorphic, juristic, are shown in great detail. Perhaps the freshest and most interesting section is that which contrasts, in this regard, Mysticism and "Prophetism." After devoting many pages to a capable summary of what these two views stand for, Heiler brings out, in a manner that recalls Principal Fairbairn, the results as seen in the prayers of representatives of the two. The difference is apparent in every regard—in the motive, the form, the content, and the norm of prayer. The prayer of the mystic has its root in the longing of the soul for communion with the Infinite: evangelical, prophetic prayer has its source in the heart-felt need and desire for salvation and grace. The mystic's prayers are artistically prepared by the delicate psycho-technique of meditation: the prayers of the other pour forth spontaneously from the subconscious depths of a soul stirred to religious emotion. The former is a quiet, silent adoring, beholding and enjoying: the latter is a passionate crying and sighing, a violent complaining and pleading. Mystical prayer is a lengthy, gradual ascent to the heights of the vision of God and union with Him: prophetical prayer is an urgent pressing to God's Fatherly heart. Mystical prayer represents a movement in a straight line, a continuous process of advance: in prophetical prayer

there is accomplished an inward transformation, a radical revolution—timid, torturing fear and urgent desire are changed into peaceful, cheerful confidence, and calm, glad resignation. The God of the mystic is the infinite *One*, the *summum bonum*, in which he himself is lost: the God of the evangelical heart is the living Lord, to Whom he cleaves with the last fibre of his being, the loving Father, to Whom he clings with absolute confidence and with a hope that cannot be shaken. Mystical prayer is a being consumed in the furnace of love to God, a being melted in the glow of the Infinite, a being dissolved in the waters of the Immeasurable: prophetical prayer is a mighty struggle with a challenging God—"I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me." The prayer of the mystic is a pining away in a longing for the Divine Beloved—"Return"—and then, again, a blissful resting in the embrace of the heavenly Bridegroom, "I am Thine and Thou art mine"; prophetical prayer is a reverent falling before the majesty of the Eternal King and Lord ("Look graciously upon me"), a timid entreaty of the guilt-laden heart in the presence of the stern Judge ("*Miserere mei*," "God, be merciful to me, a sinner"), the intimate speech of the child with his loving Father ("Our Father, which art in heaven"). In comparison with primitive prayer, mystical prayer is something absolutely new—complete separation from one's own ego, absorption into the *summum bonum*. In prophetical prayer, primitive prayer awakes to life, purified and ennobled, indeed, but with all its passion, with all its *naïveté*, in all its intense, dramatic livingness. Like primitive prayer, prophetical prayer is, in its essence, the expression of need, petition for salvation and bliss, faith in a God who hears and helps. There are points of resemblance also between the two, but even these reveal the deep-seated, essential difference. Mystical prayer is directed towards the attainment

of a value that has a final validity, something static, a *summum bonum*; the goal of prophetical prayer is something that is alive, something dynamic, *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. To the mystic, the highest value transcends all reality and all multiplicity, *τὸ ἕν, μόνον*; to prophetical piety, the highest value dominates and pervades all reality and reveals itself in multiplicity, *ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*.

Here is Heiler's definition of prayer. "Prayer is a living communion of the religious man with God, conceived as personal and present in experience, a communion which reflects the forms of human social relations." He thus claims to have established the truth of what all religious men and all students of religion have declared, that prayer is the heart of religion, the living soul of all piety. He finds his proof in the essential nature of prayer, as disclosed in his examination of all its types among all classes of men. It has many outworks and externals, attitudes, methods, gestures, times and seasons, but these are of little account. He who knows that God is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth pays little heed to these. Prayer is living communion with God; it brings man into immediate touch with God, into a personal relation to Him. And it is the only thing that does so. It is through prayer that religion becomes a Life in God, a fellowship with Him. Without prayer, faith is a theoretical conviction: apart from prayer all worship, meditation, adoration, devotion are merely external forms: without prayer, man remains at a distance from God, and a chasm yawns between the finite and the infinite. "God is in heaven, and thou upon earth" (Eccles. v. 2). We cannot come to God at all, we cannot come near to the Divine, nor touch the springs of the Divine, save by prayer. In the words of Mechtild von Magdeburg, a nun of the Middle Ages, "Prayer draws the great God down into a little heart; it raises the hungry soul to God, Who holds all things."

Being thus the mysterious connecting link between man and the Eternal, prayer is an incomprehensible miracle, the miracle of miracles, happening daily in the soul of the religious man. Scientific investigation of its history and psychology ends in the acknowledgment of the miracle. The historian of religion and the student of the psychology of religion can only be witnesses and interpreters of that deep, strong life that is disclosed in prayer. Into that secret only the religious man can enter. But scientific investigation of it also stands under the same overwhelming impression as living piety, and is constrained to agree with the confession of Chrysostom, *οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν εὐχῆς δυνατώτερον οὐδὲ ἴσον.*

A. K. Dallas.

THE ORPHIC MYSTERIES.[1]

Orphism (named after Orpheus, the supposed founder of the Bacchic rites) began to spread in Greece about the middle of the sixth century B.C., and in the next two centuries was probably the strongest religious force in the Hellenic world. Even so late as the fourth century A.D. Orphic documents were still being produced, although by the opening centuries of our era these show unmistakable indications of being swept into the syncretism from which Gnosticism sprang. For almost a thousand years traces of the Orphic faith can be discovered. Hence its importance, and especially so when we remember its influence on Plato, Empedocles, Pythagoras, Pindar, Euripides, and others.

The cosmogony was peculiar. Chronos (Time) was the original generative power. Next came Aether and Chaos.

[1] The writer is specially indebted to Jas. Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, and Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*.

Out of these Chronos produced a silver egg, and from the egg came Phanes, the first-born Orphic god. Phanes was both male and female, and in him were all the seeds or potencies out of which the world sprang. When Zeus, after a succession of dynasties of gods, became supreme, he swallowed Phanes, and so all that was and would be was in his belly. Zeus thus became the original force from which development had to begin afresh. The old order is dissolved, and he becomes the sum of all things. By and by Dionysus-Zagreus appears—the son of Zeus and Persephone, the goddess of the underworld. While still a boy, his father gives to him the rule of the universe. The evil Titans pursued him, tore him to pieces, and devoured all except his heart, which Athena saves. Zeus swallows the heart, and afterwards gives birth to the new Dionysus by the mortal woman Semele. The Titans were blasted by a thunderbolt, while still covered with the blood of Zagreus. Thence sprang the race of men—their bodies from the ashes of the Titans, their souls from the living blood and the devoured body of the god. The meaning of the myth is that human nature is both divine and brutal —Titanic and Dionysiac. At present the evil element is dominant. The soul must become sensible of its divine origin, seek to subdue the Titanic elements, and so regain its lost state of divinity.

The Orphic theology was a sort of pantheism. "Zeus was the first, Zeus last, lord of the thunder; Zeus head, Zeus middle, out of Zeus all things are made, etc." You will remember in the myth, that when Zeus swallowed Phanes, he had within him all the seeds of the world.

The beliefs concerning the origin and history of the human soul are specially important. Between body and soul there is an irreconcilable dualism and a profoundly different estimation of value. The body is evil and the

prisonhouse or grave of the soul, which is in a condition analogous to death so long as it remains therein. The imprisonment within the body is due to ante-natal sin, and hence an expiatory punishment. Naturally, the doctrine that the body was the prison of the soul led to the view that when the body slept, the soul conversed with eternal things and showed its true nature. When the body slumbers, "the soul shows forth in many a vision the approaching issues of woe and weal" (Pindar). There is in Orphism no resurrection of the body.

The soul is immaterial, of divine origin, a sort of Divine ethereal essence. "I am a child of earth and starry Heaven, but my race is of Heaven alone." Each embodied soul is a kind of supernatural guest and a wanderer from Heaven. Before its embodiment it was in fellowship with gods and indeed a god. (How the soul first descends into the body is not clear, and need not detain us.)

Once the soul is in the prisonhouse of the body it begins a weary circle of reincarnations. "Before now I have been a youth, a maid, a bush, a bird, and a scaly fish in the sea." (Empedocles.)

Life in the body is a purgation, a penance for sin. The soul's true purpose is to regain the lost heavenly inheritance, to be released from the chains of the body. This can be achieved only through purity. The Orphic claim is based upon this. "Pure I come from the pure, O queen of the dead." But how can one attain purity? By a certain method of life. One must keep unspotted from the world by abstaining from flesh food (except at such festivals as the "Feast of raw flesh"), eggs, beans, and the dead are not to be buried in woollen garments. Besides these taboos emphasis was laid upon ritual, fasting, ablutions, and incantations. The purity was thus to a large extent pharisaic. (Pythagoras was indeed a reformer of Orphism when

with asceticism he coupled intellectual research as productive of holiness.) In these ways, then, it was sought during life to free the soul from those impurities which had concealed its divine origin.

After the death of the body the soul enters a purgatory—an intermediate state of rewards and punishments. This, as Farnell points out, is a corner-stone of its eschatological doctrine. The state is said to last a thousand years. Good souls apparently enjoy a certain amount of happiness, but the wicked are buried deep in mud. Be it noted that the purpose of punishment seems to be purification from the flesh. Further, the souls of the departed could be helped by prayers and rituals performed by the living.

Then, after the thousand years, or ten times the supposed full length of human life, came reincarnation. This was for those who were not incurable sinners. For such hopeless cases as Tantalus, Ixion, and Sisyphus, there was a form of eternal damnation in Tartarus. Such souls, then, as had not sinned without remedy, were reincarnated, and not necessarily in a human body. Further, as James Adam says, "We can scarcely doubt that the mode of existence allotted to the soul at each new stage of her career on earth was determined by the degree of purity which she possessed at the moment of re-incarnation." Thus each life—earth or Hades—was the reward or punishment for the state of the other.

Release from these rounds of reincarnation, however, was possible. The time taken was variously estimated at ten thousand or three thousand years, or a triple good life on either side—three in Hades and three on earth. The soul then wins back the divine inheritance lost through sin. Once more it holds communion with gods and becomes a god. Such a one is saluted: "O happy and blessed one, thou shalt be a god instead of a mortal"; "Thou

art become a god from having been a man." Empedocles felt he was so near the longed for consummation that he actually claimed "to be no longer a mortal, but an immortal God." Thus in the Orphic faith, divinity is regained through purity. Note that the soul is not absorbed into the Infinite, there is no loss of individuality.

Paradise seems to have been somewhat differently conceived. From Plato (*Republic*, ii. 363) we gather that in Heaven "the saints lie on couches at a feast, everlastingly drunk, and crowned with garlands." The Orphic idea, he says, "seems to be that an eternity of drunkenness is the highest meed of virtue." On the other hand, in the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus, a nobler picture is drawn of the future state. Here the souls live a peaceful, idyllic, cultured life amidst all the beauties of a perpetual spring. Plato was not altogether unsympathetic with Orphism; hence, while we may well believe that higher conceptions were prevalent in some quarters, his censure would indicate that the lower conception was very common.

Was this Paradise permanent? Was there no more possibility of reincarnation? It would seem so; for the Orphic tablets do not contemplate any other issue. Most students take this view. On the other hand, there is some slight evidence that after a while the soul would have to begin the circle all over again. Perhaps it was expected that the events which caused the first imprisonment in the body would recur. But this rests on a slender foundation.

It is thus clear that eschatological ideas were highly developed and systematized in Orphism; that the claim to immortality was grounded on belief in the divine element in the soul; and that this same belief was used as a moral and spiritual motive. Further, the consequences of sin must be borne by the sinner himself. His rise or

fall in the various incarnations is due to himself. Each one must bear his own guilt.

The evidence for these doctrines has been pieced together by scholars from allusions in classical authors (especially Plato, Empedocles, and Pindar), references in the early Christian Fathers, vase paintings, sculpture, the so-called Orphic poems, and especially the golden plates or tablets found in Orphic tombs in South Italy and Crete. These tablets were placed in tombs and supplied to the dead directions for his conduct in the world of shades. These are to be dated from the fourth to the second centuries B.C., but embody beliefs which are much older.

J. B. Bury (*History of Greece*, p. 312) has pointed out that Orphism is based on three Greek institutions. (1) The Dionysiac worship which originated in Thracia in the eighth century B.C. This was a wild night worship on the mountains and in the woods, in which the worshippers danced themselves into frenzied ecstasy and tore and devoured the flesh of the sacred victims. While in ecstasy they were supposed to be in fellowship with Dionysus and through such union to become divine even after death. In a sense, Orphism was a reformation of the Dionysiac religion. While adhering somewhat to the Dionysiac ritual, it eliminated from it some of its savage exercises and implanted religious and philosophic elements. In the older faith, as Miss Harrison well says, communion with deity was sought through intoxication, in Orphism this was sought by abstinence and rites of purification. (2) The Orphics also aspired to take the place of the itinerant seers, sybils, and purifiers who abounded in Greece. (3) They also adopted and developed ideas in the Eleusinian mysteries. Initiates in these, by participation in elaborate ceremonies and sacred mummeries, received an assurance of happiness in the life to come.

Unlike the Eleusinian and Samothracian cults, Orphism was not a state religion. It was made up of associations of private individuals. These communities do not seem to have had much organization or a central authority. They were simply bound together by identity of belief and practice. Gomperz argues that the members were rather of the middle than the ruling and the powerful classes.

With respect to the place where Orphism originally took shape there is much division of opinion. Gomperz thinks that the cosmogony came from Babylon, the belief in transmigration from India, and that Egypt is responsible for some of its ethical feeling. Farnell, Burnet, and Pearson will have none of the Indian origin. It seems best to think of the Orphic doctrines as the result of Greek reflection upon Thracian-Dionysiac beliefs. The doctrine of transmigration could have developed independently in many parts of the world; it is as likely to have been as native to Thracia as to India or Egypt. Burnet thinks that both Greece and India may have derived it from a northern people, the Scythians.

To trace the influence of this cult upon later thought is too great a task here. It is sufficient to note that Plato accepted and put to beautiful use the Orphic doctrine of the body as the grave of the soul; Pindar's poetry is enriched by its doctrine of the celestial nature of the soul and its eschatology; most of the leading doctrines can be found in Empedocles; and Aeschylus, Euripides, and Aristophanes show a knowledge of it. The relationship between Orphism and Pythagoras is harder to define. It is difficult to say which gives or takes from the other, what is pure Orphism and pure Pythagorism. It seems, however, that Pythagoras effected a sort of reformation of Orphism. For example, he added intellectual research to abstinence and

ceremonial rites as means of salvation. The Pythagorean communities were practically Orphic.

What was the attraction of this mystery-religion? As Sir Gilbert Murray has said, it "affected every oracle and popular temple from Caria to Italy" and was, as we have seen, the strongest religious force in the Hellenic world of the fifth and fourth centuries. The explanation is not difficult. (*a*) It gave an assurance of a future life to those who were terribly conscious of the limits of mortality, and one which could not be derived from the national religion with its cold and comfortless Hades. The pains and sorrows of life, which receive such striking melancholy expression in literature, would lead many to think of and long for another world than this. (*b*) Further, the traditional and conventional worships were losing their hold upon the people. Philosophy arose and endeavoured to solve the mystery of things. It explained the world by natural science. It sought truth, the direct look at the world and all that was. But, as Murray writes, "It was all very well for Thales to be saved by knowledge, the common man could not look that way." The philosopher has a passion for truth, and he puts it first. The crowd seeks comfort first, with it truth is never a passion; it demands short cuts and immediate results. The exercise of intellect was too cold and suited only the austere and the "high-brow," and so ordinary people turned in their emotional craving to the Orphic hymns and ritual, so brimful of joy and expressive of immediate satisfaction. (*c*) Moreover, it professed to satisfy the instinctive craving in human nature (think of the Eden story) to be a God, and to have a very personal and individual relation with God. In such fellowship men thought to obtain the greatest need and longing of the time—Salvation. (*d*) Further, it was a kind of elect band, almost a freemasonry. To be an initiate was

to be a spiritual aristocrat. Inner circles have ever an almost irresistible fascination.

The last question before us is whether or not the effects of this mystery-cult were elevating and helpful. Farnell has said that, with the exception of a single passage in Diodorus Siculus with respect to the Samothracian mysteries, the voice of antiquity is silent concerning any claim of the initiates to a higher morality. Certainly we are told nothing about any such Orphic claim. Plato (*Republic*, ii. 364) expresses the utmost contempt for the Orphic ritual and the pardon-mongering of the priests, as if the Gods could be bought off. Undoubtedly the emphasis was laid upon ritual, taboo, the external. There were revolting practices, such as the ceremonial feasts of raw flesh, the drinking of the blood and the devouring of the body of the god. High religious ecstasy led to moral perils. True, the Orphic must be pure, but this meant mainly ceremonial holiness and freedom from notorious stains of guilt. Besides, the initiates were probably left to judge their own purity. Further, the irrational was emphasized as the truest manifestation of the Divine. Fortunately for the world the philosophers kept steadily to the duty of providing religion with a sure foundation in thought.

But there is another side. The effects were not all bad. There were probably higher as well as lower Orphics. On some membership would undoubtedly leave a good moral impression. It would depend upon the initiate himself to take out of it what his character suggested. After all, even good faiths may attract the fraud, the parasite, and the charlatan. Gomperz goes too far in saying that what distinguishes Orphism from the other mysteries is the extraordinary emphasis laid upon morality, but it is an exaggeration of a truth. Some of the doctrines make for

real progressive religion. The development of conscience was greatly assisted by the separation of man's nature into Divine and Titanic, and the recognition of a bad element which had to be fought. In older Greek thought (Homer, Theognis, etc.) the gods led men into sin; it is a great advance when sin is recognized as the sinner's own doing. In the old Dionysiac religion, intoxication was used as a means of communion with deity; it was a much more elevated method to seek this by abstinence and purifications. Again, this cult emphasized man's essential kinship with God, the Soul's instinct for Him, its longing for rest in Him, and its craving to become like Him. This is an idea which has grown in value as our conceptions of God have grown more pure and true. Further, religion was separated from the state. The Orphic was one from choice. T. R. Glover has well said that "this carries with it, in germ, a good deal—the weighing of the claims of conscience, heart, tradition, and philosophy, and the habit of reflection in religion, of speculation." The Orphic communities were open to all, Greek and barbarian, slave and free. The bonds of kith and kin were broken. Thus began an era of individualism, a universal religion was in sight.

H. Ranston.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "WOULD you be kind enough to explain the meaning of Ezekiel xx. 49 some day in your magazine? Why did the Jews say of the prophet, 'Doth he not speak parables?' I do not understand why this should be regarded as a reproach" (J. T. Y., Edinburgh).

The passage, of which this forms the climax, shows how Ezekiel feels moved and inspired by God to denounce the people and threaten them with an imminent, severe doom (xx. 45–48). Then he reflects, "But what use is it for me to talk like this to them. They say of me, 'Doth he not speak parables?'" The Hebrew term *mashal* runs through a gamut of meanings; it denotes an oracle, like those uttered by Balaam, a proverb, a sarcastic satire (like some of Ezekiel's own utterances, e.g. in xiv. 8), a discourse of sages, or an allegory. It is not invariably obvious in meaning; sometimes the *mashal* combines a superficial clarity and a profounder sense which is hidden from the careless hearer. Now what is the meaning here? "Parables" is an inadequate rendering, though (*a*) some interpreters think that the point of the taunt lies in Ezekiel's fondness for similitudes and pictorial allegories. "Is he not just talking parables, with nothing real behind them?" This is the view taken by Miss Julia Wedgwood in her *Message of Israel* (pp. 74, 75). She quotes from a fifteenth-century rabbi to the effect that of the four grades of inspiration it is the lower forms which employ metaphorical and pictorial language, till "the enthusiasms spread themselves extremely in parables, similitudes, and allegories, in a dark and obscure manner." Then she proceeds to argue that "the inferior nature (in Jewish belief) of all such forms of inspiration is curiously illustrated by the complaint of Ezekiel, so difficult for one with Christian associations to appreciate, 'Ah, Lord, they say of me, Doth he not speak parables?' as though this were a reproach. It is difficult for those who have been brought up with Christian associations to accept a scale which relegates to a lower level the method of the Parables; yet a distrust of metaphor in dealing with spiritual realities is a feeling justified by all but its highest

exercise." However this may be, Ezekiel's hearers did not object to him because he chose this particular form of conveying spiritual truth. What they objected to was spiritual truth at all. They may indeed have made Ezekiel's "parables" the excuse for refusing to listen to his message, but it is more likely that "parables" here is used in a fairly general sense. (*b*) Neither do they taunt him with being enigmatic. There is nothing subtle or obscure, e.g. about the warning of verses 46–48. The purport of it is quite intelligible. (*c*) What they meant was that Ezekiel was talking about things which they considered either untrue or irrelevant to their practical lives. The prophet was to deliver this message from Yahweh to Israel in Palestine : *I will kindle a fire within you, to burn up every green tree and every dry tree in you ; there will be no quenching of the blaze, and every face from south to north shall be scorched. The whole world shall see that I, Yahweh, kindled the fire ; it shall not be quenched.* But the prophet anticipates what will be said. "Is he not a story-teller ?" That is, he is romancing ; such tales and threats have no reference to us. The people were serenely self-satisfied, and refused to entertain the idea that the prophet was speaking of anything real and relevant. Had he been amusing, they might have listened to his stories, as they sometimes did to his rhetorical, lyrical outbursts with an æsthetic appreciation (xxxiii. 32), which went no further. But this time he was not even amusing, he was loud and denunciatory. So they dismissed the matter from their minds ; "it is simply Ezekiel's stories !" The prophet's words were to them no more than "his fads and fancies." Mr. Hale White, when an edition of *The Mirror of Perfection* had been published, wrote to a friend that it was sad to think such a book was now no more than a piece of literature. "People will admire it, lounging in their chairs, but nobody will do what it ordains." Ezekiel's contemporaries would not even admire these oracles of his ; they were not sufficiently interested even to resent them, but contemptuously put them by as mere stories.

(*b*) ". . . Some reviewers say that they are reminded of music-hall ditties by your rendering of Canticles, as, for example, in phrases like these, 'No wonder girls adore you,' and 'I liken you, my dear, to a filly in the Pharaoh's chariot.' Do such renderings really correspond to the original, or are the reviewers astray again ?" (A. C., Dundee).

I don't know the literature of music-hall ditties, but the renderings you cite happen to be accurate. The Song of Solomon is not a religious poem ; it is a collection of love-lyrics, steeped in Orientalism, with occasional touches of the frank familiarity which characterizes such verses in any age. " Girls " is better than " virgins " or " maidens," obviously ; it means the women of the hareem. You have a similar usage in Herrick's *Hesperides*, for example :

> " Gentle friends, though I despaire
> Of my cure, doe you beware
> Of those girles which cruell are."

The heroine of Canticles declares, as Mr. M. Jastrow puts it, that " all the girls are in love with her lover—an admission on the part of the passionate maiden which enhances the consciousness of her own charms, so superior as to be able to attract the exclusive attention of the popular idol."

As for the comparison, it may sound poor and pointless to a modern, but Orientals understood it. I quote Jastrow again : " to compare one's beloved to a mare of the royal stables is to sing the praises of her beauty in a major key " for Orientals or Arabs who loved this simile. The English Version translates " a company of horses," which is meaningless ; the word is a feminine singular, and, instead of translating it by " my mare," as some scholars like Mr. W. W. Cannon do, I prefer " a filly," as the nearest equivalent in our English vocabulary. This is an Addisonian term ; it occurs in *The Spectator* (211)—" I am joined in wedlock for my sins to one of those fillies who are described in the old poet." The term brings out the nuance of playful affection here which an Oriental lover would express in comparing a woman to a horse.

It is no trouble, I assure you, to answer your queries. Even though they are upon comparatively small points, as in the present case, they raise a wider issue, e.g. in relation to the whole version of Canticles, which it is useful to settle once for all.

PS.—Since I wrote this, a correspondent has kindly sent me a letter informing me that " filly " has been already used here by Dr. A. R. Gordon in his *Poets of the Old Testament* (p. 319), and by my learned colleague, Professor John E. McFadyen in *The Wisdom Books in Modern Speech* (p. 218). So I am in excel-

lent company. As for the "girls," suppose I had written "lasses," which would have been equally suitable. What a squeak would have risen from some newspaper reviewers; they would have called it "undignified" or "vulgar," and even the *Times Literary Supplement* might have gravely branded it as another Scotticism. Yet we know how Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie writes in his Epilogue:

> "In Cordova of the Moors
> There dwelt a passion-minded King,
> Who set great bands of marble-hewers
> To fashion his heart's thankgiving
> In a tall palace, shapen so
> All the wondering world might know
> The joy he had of his Moorish lass."

I wonder if any reviewer was so left to himself as to attack Mr. Abercrombie's "lass" as vulgar, undignified, a Scotticism, and all the rest of it. In any case the poet knew by a fine literary sense that "lass" was the inevitable word here. And so, peace to my reviewers, did I, in rendering the Hebrew of Canticles i.

REVIEWS.

Jesus and the Greeks or Early Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism. By William Fairweather, M.A., D.D. (Edin.), Kirkcaldy. 376 pp. + Appendices, pp. 377–407. T. and T. Clark, 1924.

This is a book worthy of its subject and its author Dr. Fairweather has been a life-long student of what, borrowing partly from the title of one of his books, we may call the "Background" of Christianity. It is over thirty years since his first publication, entitled *From the Exile to the Advent*, appeared. In writing this compact and scholarly handbook the author was commencing the labours of a literary lifetime, whose finest fruit is now given us. This early work showed shrewd insight into the probable aims of the youthful conqueror Alexander. Dr. Fairweather was too modest to obtrude his own perceptions upon the scholarly world, but he could not ignore them in himself. They served the purpose of a kind of retaining-fee contract under which the author

held himself bound, in the interest of the Christian public, to continue in a region of research, where, as it probably seemed to him, exact knowledge and sane theorizing have been rather conspicuously absent. Anyhow, in his writings succeeding that first, viz. his commentary on the *First Book of Maccabees* (in collaboration with his late brother-in-law, Dr. J. S. Black) in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, his *Background of the Gospels* (Cunningham Lectures, 1908), and now his *Jesus and the Greeks* (dedicated "To the memory of J. S. B.") he has, with an exclusiveness one is tempted to regret, continued working in the same field. Few scholars are fitter than Dr. Fairweather to speak to us from the heart of the historic Revelation, but he has been content with the one task—after all great enough—of drawing true lines of connexion between that revelation and the secular world, mainly "Hellenic," to which it came and which it in some sense drew into itself.

The book before us is in three Parts: I, The Diffusion of Hellenism (11 chaps.); II, The Jewish Hellenist Philo of Alexandria (6 chaps.); III, Hellenism and Christianity (7 chaps.). There are four valuable Appendices, of which the fourth and shortest collecting the references in the book to Josephus, Philo and the Talmudic writings will not be the least appreciated by scholars. In Part I we have, *inter alia*, a suggestive chapter on Alexander's hellenizing policy, a fine philosophical and critical chapter on the Stoics and Epicuræans, and a striking chapter on the failure of Hellenism in Alexandria itself with valuable notes on the individual characteristics of the Ptolemies. A special chapter is given to the different case of Syria, where the attempts of the Antiochi to quicken the pace of the Hellenic development became first the danger and then, through the reaction of the Maccabæan revolt, the salvation of the Monotheistic faith. Chapter IX is a trenchant exhibition of the "defects of Hellenic culture," particularly on its ethical and religious side, while *per contra* the two closing chapters treat with great fullness the characteristics of the "piety" and the "social life" which Hellenism fostered.

In the six valuable chapters on Philo, which make up Part II, we have space to notice only one point. Dr. Fairweather frankly admits the Philonic influence in the New Testament, but, unless we are much mistaken, scholars will have to go further in the

direction of tracing that influence, particularly in the Fourth Gospel, than in his modesty and caution Dr. Fairweather is willing to lead us.

Equally lamentable is the little space we can give to Part III, which will seem to many the most valuable section of the entire book. The two most important chapters are perhaps Chapters VI and VII, dealing with the relationship at once of antagonism and affinity, between Christianity and Hellenism. Dr. Fairweather's remarks, to take but one example, on the alleged "Sacramentarianism of St. Paul" will be welcomed by many as a sane counteractive to the exaggeration of the influence of the Hellenic "Mysteries" on the framers of early Christian *praxis*, with which some theologians of our day have made us familiar. Paul "emphatically declares that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." This witness is not "at all weakened by the fact that sacramentarianism was already creeping into the Church (Acts xxii. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 29). Alongside of the Pauline position may be set the statement in the (probably spurious) appendix to St. Mark's Gospel: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' It is not to be supposed that in the first part of the antithesis the writer meant that baptism is as essential to salvation as *believing*, and the omission of baptism from the second part is surely significant" (p. 343). Again: "It is significant that while St. Paul freely applies the term 'mystery' to the gospel he nowhere uses it with reference to the sacraments" (p. 345).

Speaking of what might be described as Christian ecstasy as illustrated by the words of Jesus, "I have come to throw fire on the earth . . ." etc., Dr. Fairweather writes: "Between this morally-conditioned enthusiasm and that of the Hellenistic theurgist, or that of the Mithras mystic, who sought by screams and laboured breathing to inhale the divine so as in ecstatic rapture to lose all consciousness of things seen and temporal, there is a great gulf fixed" (p. 347).

This is an inadequate notice of a book that illustrates in a rare degree the qualities desirable in a pastor and a scholar. Dr. Fairweather has served one and the same congregation with the living verities of the faith for about forty-four years. Part of the secret of the wealth of spiritual provender at his command has

been the extent and accuracy of the researches which have made him acquainted with the world—Greek, Latin and Hebrew—to which in the first instance the new faith came.

LEWIS A. MUIRHEAD.

* * * * *

Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus? A candid Enquiry by Douglas S. Guy, B.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Harrogate, with a Foreword by the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Ripon. Student Christian Movement. 213 pp. 6*s.* net.

In twelve chapters Canon Guy discusses with admirable candour and reverence—though possibly for some readers with too much detail and reiteration—the important question which the title of his book indicates. The answer to the question, as Canon Guy abundantly shows, depends largely on what we mean by "institute"—whether the verb or the noun. A simple "Yes" or "No" given as the conclusion from "external" evidence would not meet the case. And if the Canon is right, as we believe in the main he is, a "Yes" or "No" of this kind is not attainable. Moving in the region of *external* evidence we shall hardly get beyond the Scottish verdict of "Not proven." Thus, textual evidence is against the "words of institution" and the words about the Cup in Luke xxii. 19 b, 20. This drives us to a comparison of the Mark-Matthew testimony with that of the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians xi. 23 ff. In St. Paul the evidence of "institution" is distinct and even elaborate (v. 24 f.). But in Mark-Matthew, while we have the words, "This is My Body," we have nothing suggesting a rite to be permanently observed. At the level of external evidence this is an ominous fact. Mark's Gospel is later than 1 Corinthians. If the words of institution were so explicit as St. Paul, speaking in the name of a tradition which he expressly traces to the Lord Jesus, alleges, how comes it that Mark-Matthew should omit the all-important words? There seems no escape from the conclusion that mere external evidence makes difficulties, but solves none. Still Canon Guy is deeply and, we believe, justly convinced that the Christian Sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper, are traceable to Jesus. He will not yield to the view that we owe the Sacraments simply to the free inventiveness of the Church, even though working on historic materials offered by the Old Testament. Still less will he yield to the view that they owe both their form and significance to the Pagan Mystery-

religions. But to be able to say, as in spite of his apparent hesitation Canon Guy believes we are entitled to say, that the Lord Jesus "instituted" the Eucharist, one must make excursions into history too elaborate to be described in this brief notice. We may take space, however, to indicate the general conclusion, and to give a sample of what it implies in Canon Guy's own words. The conclusion, we take it, is that our Lord did "institute" the Eucharist. Only we must understand the *institution* not in a "static" but rather in a "dynamic" sense. Jesus may never have said, "This do in remembrance of Me." But the spirit of the occasion spoke all that these words could convey. And it did it more effectually than any form of words suggesting a prescribed ritual could do. For the Spirit (we may surely write the word with a capital initial) was Jesus Himself in the act of dying and giving Himself (in that act) to His own.

The following abridgment of Canon Guy's conclusions with use of his own words, may give some idea of the author's style: "The idea of a mere parting meal which was altered and changed by the Church after the Death and Resurrection of Jesus will not satisfy the situation. At the same time conceptions of elaborate ceremonial, either of the Passover or of later Eucharistic celebrations, have to be set aside. We must fix our thoughts upon the usual surroundings of ordinary Jewish meals, sanctified by a thanksgiving pronounced over the bread and wine such as Jesus had often made use of in earlier days. Nevertheless this was a unique occasion. It was not only the last occasion when Jesus was to share with His disciples this sacred table-fellowship. But He was here to unite them to Himself, speaking those most challenging words, 'This My Body' and describing His blood as being shed to unite them in a covenant with God. Therefore this was a beginning as well as an ending, the institution of an abiding Sacrament as well as the fulfilling of religious institutions of the past. And the diversity of meanings attached to it by the Church bears witness to its being so framed as to wait for fuller interpretation, some part of which we find in St. Paul and some part in St. John, but much of which was to be discovered later" (selections from pp. 199 and 200).

It must be added that the book is constructed in a workman-life style. There are clear synopses of all the chapters, and in many cases instructive appendices mapping out to the student

his way in discussions that lie beyond the author's purpose. The bibliographies attached to many of the chapters are singularly full and relevant.

LEWIS A. MUIRHEAD.

* * * * *

The Life, Letters and Religion of St. Paul. By C. T. Wood, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Queen's College, Cambridge. 400 pp. + Appendix, pp. 401–8, and Index, pp. 409–18. Two good maps. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

In his Preface Mr. Wood modestly disclaims the possession of "a master-hand." His "book is meant for young theological students at Cambridge and elsewhere," but the author hopes it "may be of interest to others and of help to masters of senior forms at schools." The reviewer does not regret having taken time to read the book from board to board, and is confident in saying that it will more than fulfil its author's expectations. The literature on the Pauline Epistles and Travels is enormous. Yet there are not many books even among those whose scale is larger than that of Mr. Wood's, which keep the reader so constantly at the heart of the great subject and which contain at the same time so much truly helpful discussion, brief but incisive, on matters that are still in debate among scholars. The secret of the former of these effects is perhaps mainly the attention Mr. Wood pays to the third member of the triad indicated in the title of his book. Religion is nothing if not experimental. Mr. Wood does not deny that there are theological elements in the Pauline utterances, such as, e.g., the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, that go beyond religious experience, and may borrow from current tradition or philosophy, but he inclines to think that the amount of this element has been exaggerated, and that anyhow the expositor's first duty, even in the case of utterances that have an obviously speculative aspect, is to ascertain how far they may be explicable from the level of simple religious experience. On the whole, we believe Mr. Wood's consistent endeavour to keep at this level, or at any rate to start from it, has had happy results. He has produced a book upon the Pauline writings and upon St. Paul himself that is within its self-chosen limits strong, sane, and satisfying, and will assuredly help many more than those who may be privileged to hear the living voice of the writer. Take as a sample chosen almost at random, the following comments on

Romans v. 12 ff. : " With our modern knowledge we feel certain that primitive men never started with such a clean slate as Paul attributes to Adam ; they inherited the instincts of the tiger and the ape. But the root fact of Christianity remains, apart from any variety in explanation that *all men are sinful and need a Redeemer*. St. Paul adds that the Redeemer must be a man like ourselves. It is also unquestionably true that we are too much dependent on our environment to make it possible for the individual to be perfected in the present state of society to which he belongs. Individual redemption in Christ is, thank God, a fact. But it is always conditioned in part by our environment, particularly our Church. All men are linked together by indissoluble ties " (p. 260).

It is perhaps fair to say, *per contra*, that we are not so sure of Mr. Wood's exegetical success at Romans viii. 3 (p. 265). He renders the momentous words *κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί* by " condemned sin in human nature," the natural meaning of which English words, viz. *He made sin inexcusable in human nature*, however true to fact, is, we are for our part confident, *not* the meaning intended by the Apostle (see Denney *in loco* in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*).

As a specimen of well-balanced valuable critical judgment we commend especially the author's discussion of the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles. Particularly noteworthy is the clear and, we think, wholly valid distinction between the questions : (1) Are the situations relating to St. Paul presupposed in the Pastorals on the whole historical ? and (2) Was Paul the writer of the Pastorals ? We have not space to follow Mr. Wood in his arguments, but he says practically *Yes* to (1) and *No* to (2). We have read no discussion of this important matter that has seemed to us quite so compact and so convincing as Mr. Wood's. We wish the book many readers.

Lewis A. Muirhead.

CURRENT ISSUES.

THE ATONEMENT: A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

Dear X.,—

I do not suppose that any statements of mine upon the Atonement can command your assent or prove to you a light amid darkness. If what I have already written in the closing chapter of my *Historic Theories* and again in my *Interpreter* article has gone for nothing, it is unlikely that a letter can be useful now. Yet it lies very heavily upon my heart that you should have spoken almost despairingly of the attitude of so many modern Evangelicals towards the grand truth that Christ died for our sins. Let me at least try to show that one member of our little group, who talked together on this bafflingly mysterious theme, seems to himself not only to believe in the atoning death but to be able to state some kind of reason—however pathetically incomplete—for his glorying in the Cross of Christ.

I find in the New Testament two purposes associated with the death of our Lord. That death procures or conveys forgiveness of sins (Romans iii.–v.); and it procures or conveys the new life (Romans vi.–viii.). Historically, the main emphasis has been laid upon the first of these. The penal theory is the clearest reading of the theology which grows out of this way of approach to a doctrine of atonement. Clearness, however, is not our supreme need. Possibly the theory in question is all too clear; possibly it possesses clearness of the wrong sort—at least, when taken as a scientific gnosis; acceptable it must be, whether in or out of the Bible, as a symbol or parable of truths which in their completeness elude our grasp. Upon the penal theory, the punishment of an innocent substitute is held to afford warrant—in the moral sphere; the sphere of conscience—for the forgiveness of the guilty. A strange type of morality, surely! Dale for one, resolutely as he maintains the doctrine of retributive

justice, and loyally as he proclaims the great "fact" of salvation through Christ's death, is conscious of extreme difficulty in justifying the traditional morality and theology of penal substitution. And, among four reasons which he advances for holding that the penal theory, though precarious, may still be defended, is the other Bible teaching already noted—the truth that the sufferings of Christ are the greatest of all factors in the regeneration of human character.

This second aspect of the saving work of Christ is regarded as fundamental by very many modern thinkers. They treat it not indeed or not necessarily as the whole truth, but as—for us—the inevitable starting-point when we seek to construe in terms of doctrine the great saving fact. I confess that I feel a certain painful misgiving whether, after all, it is warrantable to regard forgiveness as secondary and the new life as primary. Yet, provisionally at least, I also must seek to begin at this point and to advance along the line which it opens to us.

In our study of the New Testament we might connect the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Christ, having been tempted without sinning, is able to succour those who now are tempted—that He learned obedience by suffering, and being made perfect became the Author of eternal salvation to His people—with the doctrine of Romans vi.–viii., that the culmination of this great moral process was the death on the Cross. We thus perceive that our God did not propose to rescue man by an exercise of mere power, nor yet by pronouncing an amnesty in bland indifference to the evil of past sin, but by calling us to the fellowship of One who was in perfect communion with Himself, and who has done the divinest of all God's works in breaking the chains of our sin, and in bestowing upon those who were most unworthy the very peace of God. He who had lived His way into communion with us finally *died* His way into saving and lifegiving fellowship with His helpless human brethren. He forgives, I have ventured to write, because He has made provision for the renewal of our character, but never, never, never in the proportion in which our character is actually renewed, and—so to say—raised from the dead. Nay, rather this is God's gospel, that *when we are worst we need forgiveness most, and He grants it freely.*

There is more in the theology which I am seeking to outline

than a recognition of Divine love in the Cross—which too often thins away in so-called " moral " theories into a belief that God is indifferent to moral distinctions or is immorally indulgent towards unrepentant sinners. This Christ whom we seek to preach is the very power of God unto salvation—" a lever to raise us " (if it is desired to use that form of words) from hell itself to the topmost heights of heaven.

It must be confessed that our theory has its obscurities ; e.g. (1) Christ is sinless, but the new life which He imparts to His people is not, here and now, a complete or sinless victory ; (2) Christ is the fountain-head of human purity, yet we dare not write off the virtues of worldly or pagan men as " vices in fancy dress."

But may we not recognize, and proclaim with all boldness, that the perfect loyalty of Christ, under trial to the uttermost, is the only power which can promise rescue and victory to the very worst of mankind ? And that a salvation which does not reach to the blackest sinner could be of no avail whatever even for the whitest—or, to speak more accurately, the grayest—among all the flock of lost sheep ? No soul of man can cut loose from the world of which he is a part, that world which still lies in wickedness and misery. Therefore Christ is not the Saviour of any unless He be the Saviour and rightful Lord of all. The virtuous pagan needs Christ, and the innocent child needs Christ. Inheritors of the world's dark lot, we escape only as joint-heirs with Jesus Christ of God, His Father and ours. And our new and better inheritance comes to us by God's boundless mercy, which must ultimately triumph with a completeness to which we dare put no limit, inasmuch as the price was paid, the battle fought, the victory gained long ages ago. For, although the Kingdom of God will not come without our loyal service—and woe be to us, if we are disloyally slack !—the exceeding greatness of the power is of God and not of us, and Christ is in very deed the Saviour of mankind. He has done for us that which utterly needed to be done by us or for us, and which we never could do for ourselves. And so man is redeemed, and God is glorified, and grace reigns, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Yours ever very truly,

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

Recapitulation. Second line of criticism—MT 'unreliable' (charge of 'unthinking' acceptance, and answer).

Thesis of Article—The substantial accuracy of the MT.

Textual Criticism—Brief statement of its nature.

I. The Massoretic Text.
   1. Hebrew MSS.—variants.
   2. The Samaritan Pentateuch.
   3. The Targums.
   4. Aquila.
   5. The Peshitta.
   6. The Vulgate.

Summing up of Part I.

II. The Septuagint Text.
   1. History.
   2. Recensions, dependent versions, and quotations.
   3. State of text. No critical text. Cambridge LXX. Lagarde. Tentative statement as to the Divine Names. Table.

III. Comparison of the two Texts.
   1. Four general points.
      i. MT is in the original Hebrew; LXX is a Greek translation.
      ii. The difference between the Divine Names in Hebrew and Greek.
      iii. Intrinsic evidence largely fails us.
      iv. Possible variants are limited; probability therefore of accidental coincidence.

(*To be continued next month.*)

Article 3. Textual Criticism. The Massoretic Text and the Septuagint.

Professor Welch based his thesis that 'the analysis of the Genesis stories,' based upon 'the differing use of the Divine Names Yahweh and Elohim,' has been 'seriously shaken' upon two lines of criticism (Expositor, May, 1923, p. 346). The first line, viz., that the use of the Divine Names was governed, not by the usage of different writers,

but by the differing value of the two names as used by one and the same writer, has been dealt with in the concluding section of the previous article. We saw ample reason for rejecting this as a quite insufficient explanation of the problem raised by the peculiar use of the Divine Names in Genesis, and in fact Prof. Welch himself evidently does not regard this line of argument as of much value. He rejects Möller's solution of the problem as 'so unconvincing that it has not called for very serious reply' and he speaks of the second line as raising 'a much more serious objection' (p. 347).

To the second line of criticism therefore let us now give our best attention. It is an attack upon the accuracy of the current Hebrew texts in the matter of the Divine Names. To quote Welch, "Dahse * in Germany and Wiener † in London have pointed out how often the Septuagint text differs from the Hebrew in the precise matter of the divine names and have insisted that in passages where the usage is at present uniform, the uniformity may not be original." It is well known that in other parts of the Hebrew Bible changes have been made in the Divine Names. "An entire Book of the Psalter (Book II, Pss. 42–72) exhibits by preference the name Elohim," and a comparison of Ps. 14 with Ps. 53 and of Ps. $40^{13f.}$ with Ps. 70 shows clearly that in, at any rate, some of the Psalms Elohim has been substituted for the original Yahweh.‡ What assurance then have we, these critics ask, that the present MT § of the Pentateuch represents the original?

* *Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. (1912); *A Fresh Investigation of the Sources of Genesis* (S.P.C.K., 1914).

† *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, *Pentateuchal Studies*, and *The Pentateuchal Text*.

‡ For the bearing of this upon the question at issue see Part III 2 vii (end).

§ Here and elsewhere MT is used for the Massoretic (Hebrew) Text (see Part I 1 below).

In fact, may we not say that in a large number of instances the Hebrew text underlying the LXX is clearly the more original ?

Not only has this last question been answered in the affirmative, but Wiener, followed by Welch, charges the scholars who hold ' the regnant hypothesis ' with ' unthinkingly ' accepting the trustworthiness of the MT. It doesn't seem to have occurred to them that the Dr. Driver (e.g.), who wrote the elaborate note on the chief ancient versions of the Old Testament in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Clarendon Press, 1890, pp. xxxvi.–lxxxiv.) and who made such full use of the LXX in the text of that work, was not likely to have neglected the evidence of the versions when he had to deal with the Text of the Pentateuch and that the fact that he and others trusted to the MT rather than to the LXX was due not to want of thought but to exercise of thought on rational lines.

This latter I believe to be the true explanation, and the object of this Article is to show that their trust was not misplaced.

It is not part of my thesis to maintain the infallible accuracy of the MT in regard to the Divine Names. I question whether any modern scholar has denied that errors have occurred here and there in the course of transcription.* All that I am concerned to maintain is that the evidence fully justifies belief in the substantial accuracy of the MT, as representing the final canonical form of the Pentateuch.

The attack upon the MT of the Pentateuch and especially of Genesis, with which we are now concerned, has been

* See, e.g., Notes on Gen. 14^{22} by Driver, *Genesis*, p. 166, and Carpenter and Harford, Ed.[1], Vol. II, p. 22, and on 28^{20} by Skinner, *Divine Names*, p. 42.

made in the name of Textual Criticism. Let us remind ourselves what Textual Criticism is. According to Mr. J. P. Postgate (*Enc. Brit.*, vol. 20, p. 708), it is 'the skilled and methodical application of human judgment to the settlement of texts,' the aim being the ascertainment of the 'original form' of any particular document as 'intended by its author.' This is no easy task. No one can hope to attain success in it, unless he be "a scholar who has prepared himself by general training in the analysis of texts and by special study of the facts bearing on particular cases." * "The best criticism is that which takes account of every class of textual facts and which assigns to each method its proper use and rank." "This conformity to rationally framed or rather discovered rules implies no disparagement of scholarship and insight. It does but impose salutary restraints on the arbitrary and impulsive caprice which has marred the criticism of some of those whose scholarship and insight have deservedly been held in the highest honour." Not all so-called Textual Criticism does observe these "salutary restraints," and I believe that the attempts made in that name to prove that the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis is untrustworthy recoil upon the heads of those who made them for just this reason. It is necessary to emphasize the words 'in Genesis.' We are not concerned with the text of the Old Testament as a whole, but with the text of the Pentateuch in particular (and indeed with an even narrower issue, viz., the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis and Exodus). This is important, because 'the Law' was recognized as canonical long before the rest of the Old Testament and it received a reverential

* This and the following quotations are from Dr. Hort's Introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, pp. 21, 19 and 65. The whole masterly exposition of the methods of Textual Criticism, pp. 19–72, should be consulted.

treatment at the hands of the Jews from the days of Ezra, which was not until much later accorded to their other scriptures. Statements about the condition of the MT and the value of the LXX in regard to later books must not be taken as applicable to the MT and the LXX in Genesis. We will look now, first, at the Massoretic text and, secondly, at the LXX text. The way will then be clear to proceed in Part III to decide which is the best witness to the original text.

Part I. *The Massoretic Text.*

1. The form in which the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is presented to us in MSS. and printed editions is called the Massoretic text, because it is the work of a guild of trained scholars known as Massoretes, i.e. Masters of the Massora or Tradition. In order to secure the accurate transmission and the proper pronunciation of the consonantal text, they added vowels and accents and compiled an elaborate series of notes upon its minutest peculiarities. The actual compilation of these notes went on from the sixth to the tenth centuries A.D., but it is practically certain that the consonantal text upon which they were based was fixed in the early part of the second century A.D. Several hundreds of MSS. of the Pentateuch were collated by Kennicott and de Rossi. The oldest date from the ninth and tenth centuries. They all exhibit the same text. The writings of Jerome in the fourth and of Origen in the third century show that the Hebrew text of their day was practically identical with the MT.

Evidence from the Targums and from Aquila (see 'Versions' below) carry this text back to the beginning of the second century. The scribes of that day probably chose as their exemplar "an old and well-written copy, possibly one of those which were preserved in the Court of the

Temple" (Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 69). This copy was not a perfect replica of the original autographs, but whether errors had already actually arisen *in the matter of the Divine Names* is a matter to be determined on strictly scientific principles.

An examination of extant Hebrew MSS., containing Gen. 1^{1} to Ex. 6^{3}, shows that in them the variations in the Divine Names are very slight indeed. Dr. Skinner (*Divine Names in Genesis*, pp. 264–6) has given a Table, showing a total of 51 variants in Genesis to 37 names. A study of it reveals the following facts. (i) The general accuracy of the MSS. in this respect is remarkable. Kennicott collated nearly 320 MSS. of Genesis in whole or in part, and de Rossi also collated hundreds. Only 46 K. MSS. and 22 de R. MSS., out of all these hundreds, show any variants at all. Of these 68 MSS. 39 have only one variant, 16 have two, 8 have three, 2 have four, 2 have five and 1 has six. (ii) Fifteen of the variants are in the 6 passages ($18^{3, 27, 31}$, 20^{4}; $15^{2, 8}$) where Adonai or Adonai-Yahweh occurs. In these only do we find variants supported by more than 3 MSS. The cause of this is obvious. The sacred name YHWH was not pronounced at all. In public reading it was pronounced Adonai (or Elohim). A scribe, writing to dictation or pronouncing the words aloud before writing them down, was very liable to write the name pronounced instead of the name written in his exemplar. Of the remaining 36 variants 1 is impossible (Elohim Yahweh, 35^{10}); 12 are omissions (in 10 cases by only one MS. each, 1 by two and 1 by three); 1 is an insertion (15^{9}) by two MSS.; the remaining 22 ring changes on Yahweh, Elohim and Yahweh-Elohim (2 only are read by as many as 3 MSS., 5 by 2, and 15 by 1 MS. each). (iii) Moreover we must weigh the MSS. as well as count them. Some swarm with corrections and erasures, some are too late to be of

any independent value. But even if we were to accept them all as of equal value, the wonder would still be, not that there are so many, but that there are so few, variants actually to be found. Those that there are are naturally accounted for as transcriptional errors. So far therefore as Hebrew MSS. go, there is nothing to lead one to doubt the accuracy of the MT.*

2. By good fortune we have in *the Samaritan Pentateuch* a most valuable witness to the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names. It is a recension of the Hebrew Pentateuch, possessed and used by the schismatic Samaritan community. Its antiquity is shown by the fact that it is written in a degenerate variety of the old Hebrew writing, which was essentially the same as that found upon the Moabite stone and in the tunnel of the Pool of Siloam. Moreover the hostility which existed between Jews and Samaritans after the schism was set up makes it practically certain that this Samaritan Pentateuch must date back to the time before the schism. When did the schism occur? Opinion is divided between c. 430 B.C. (Neh. $13^{8, 28}$) and c. 330 B.C., when, according to Josephus, the Temple on Mt. Gerizim was built.† We have then here a witness, which at the latest takes us back to the fourth century B.C. On comparing the Samaritan with the Hebrew Pentateuch we find in the former (*a*) a series of intentional alterations, due in some passages to a desire to defend the legitimacy of their worship and in many others to a desire to produce a smoother and more intelligible text; (*b*) a number of lengthy insertions from parallel passages; and, apart from these, (*c*) a consonantal text very closely resembling the

* But, it may be said, these variant MSS. do not stand alone. They concur frequently with LXX and other witnesses. This will be dealt with later on (III 1 iv).

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 118–121.

MT. Von Gall's edition brings out the remarkable uniformity of the Samaritan MSS. in the matter of the Divine Names. He registers only two variants in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15} (21^{17}, 'God' for 'Angel of God'; 30^{23}, 1 MS. omits 'God'). What then has this witness to say as to the Divine Names in this whole section? There are 344 occurrences of Yahweh (146), Elohim (178) and Yahweh Elohim (20). In 334 of these the Samaritan and Hebrew texts are absolutely agreed; in, at most, ten cases is there difference.*

Copyists' errors are the obvious solution in most, if not all, of these ten cases of divergence. But what of the 334 agreements? The fact that through two independent lines of descent, starting from 430 or 330 B.C., the Divine Names in the passage under review have been transmitted with so microscopic an amount of variation surely proves two things: (1) the care exercised by both Jewish and Samaritan copyists in transcribing the names of God, at least from the date of separation, and (2) the antiquity of the distribution of the names, which is now found in the MT. As regards this later point, the present Hebrew usage is seen to be practically identical with that which obtained in the fourth or fifth century B.C., i.e. either in the days of Ezra or at the latest within a century thereof.

* The Samaritan text read E for Y in Gen. 7^{1}, 14^{22} (where the names in both texts are probably late additions, 20^{18} and Ex. 3^{4}; it reads Y for E in 7^{9}, 28^{4}, $31^{7, 9, 16a}$ (and Ex. 6^{2a}); it adds E in 35^{9b}. In 5 of these 10 divergencies the Samaritan stands absolutely alone. In the other 5 it is supported as follows:

	Hebrew MSS.	LXX authorities.	Other versions.
7^{1}	2	cw Arm-codd	Pesh. (except Cod. D= Brit. Mus. Add. 14,445, dated A.D. 464)
7^{9}	1	E.	Vulg.
20^{28}	—	bw ej Boh. Phil-arm	—
31^{9}	1	—	—
35^{9}	—	Practically unanimous	—

This last reading is an *addition* of Elohim, a divergence which makes no difference to the documentary analysis, because chap. 35 regularly uses Elohim (or El, vers. $^{1, 3, 7, 11}$), never Yahweh.

3. The Targums are based on the oral 'interpretation' into the vernacular Aramaic, which accompanied the reading of the Law in the Synagogue, when Biblical Hebrew had ceased to be a living tongue. The Babylonian Targum (Onkelos) is of no use to us, because in its written form it employs invariably Yahweh (in an abbreviated written form) as the one Divine Name. The Palestinian Targum (pseudo-Jonathon) is highly paraphrastic and in its present form belongs to the eighth century A.D. Its divergencies from the MT in the matter of the Divine Names are all in one direction, i.e. it usually substitutes Y for E, never E for Y. It gives us no light upon the original Hebrew text.

4. Before the middle of the second century A.D. the LXX had fallen into disrepute with the Rabbis as not sufficiently in accordance with the standard Hebrew text, and a Jewish scholar, named Aquila, produced an extremely literal translation from Hebrew into Greek, which 'reproduced peculiarities of Hebrew construction in conscious defiance of Greek grammar and idiom.' Hence it is a very valuable witness to the standard Hebrew text. Unfortunately only fragments and citations and marginal notes remain. Out of the 344 uses of the names in Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15} as proper names, there are only 32 where the readings of Aquila have been preserved. In 31 of these Aquila and the MT agree. In Gen. 30^{24} Aquila agrees with LXX, Symmachus and Peshitta in reading Elohim, while all Hebrew MSS. and Samaritan read Yahweh. The evidence, so far as it goes, indicates that the differences between Aquila and the MT were few and far between.

5. The Syriac Version—the Peshitta.

Nothing is certainly known as to the origin of this version, but it is common ground that it was translated direct from the Hebrew in the second century A.D. and that, at least in some MSS. and in some parts of the Old Testament, it has

been partially revised in accordance with the LXX. Out of the 344 uses of the Divine Names there are only 11 undoubted variants from the MT; in 4 more passages one to four out of five, editions read a text differing from the MT.*

The agreements with the MT are from 329 to 333. At least the larger proportion of the differences may reasonably be regarded as translator's or copyists' errors. If any of them are due to real differences between the Hebrew MS. (or MSS.) underlying the Peshitta and the official Hebrew text, they are so few in number that we can only conclude that, in that case, the former must have been an offshoot from the latter at a date later than the divergence of the Samaritan from the Hebrew.

6. The Vulgate was translated from the Hebrew by Jerome at the end of the fourth century. In only five cases (4^{1}, $6^{3.5}$, 7^{9}, 15^{6}) does the Clementine Vulgate read a different name from that in the MT, and in two of these (4^{1}, 7^{9}) there is strong MS. support for the name which agrees with the MT, so much so that Cardinal Carafa, Editor of the Louvain Bible, adopts the latter reading in both cases. The cases in which the Vulgate omits a Divine Name are, as a rule at any rate, due simply to the character of the Latin idiom and style. †

So far we have found nothing to shake our faith in the substantial trustworthiness of the MT as regards the

* Gen. 3^{11} ins. Y, 3^{24} ins. YE, 7^{1} E, 13^{10b} E, 14^{22} om. Y, 15^{6} E, 22^{11} E, 22^{15} E, 29^{32} E, 30^{24} E, 31^{16b} Y.‖ The doubtful readings are 3^{13} Y for YE in 1 edition, 30^{27} E for Y in 2 editions, 4^{10} ins. Y and 13^{10a} E for Y in 4 editions. In 7 (? 9) cases Elohim is read for Yahweh, in 1 Y for E, in 1 (? 2) Y is inserted and in 1 Y is omitted. Support is given to two (? 4) readings by LXX alone, to one by LXX and Vulg., to one by LXX, Aquila and Symmachus, to one by Samaritan (?), 2 Heb. MSS., 2 LXX cursives and Armenian MSS., to one by 2 Heb. MSS. alone, to one by the Georgian version and to one (? two) by one or two minor LXX MSS. Three (? four) have no outside support at all. (See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 140–4.)

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 144–5 and 281–8, and next month's continuation of this article, III 2 v.

Divine Names in the Pentateuch and especially in Genesis.

But at this point Dahse and Wiener and others come in with the persistent, one may say the triumphant, cry: But what about the LXX? It is the greatest and the most ancient of our versions and takes us back behind the MT and Samaritan, etc.; and, when we open and read it, we find a wide divergence from the MT-Sam.-Peshitta tradition. Here and not in the MT we find, as a rule, the true text of the Pentateuch. If insistence and confidence would carry the day, this theory would now be generally accepted and the MT discredited. But facts are stubborn things. To them let us go and see if, at the voice of practically one witness, the verdict so far arrived at must be reversed. We will look at the history of the LXX and the state of its text. We will then look at the arguments put forth by a typical exponent of the LXX theory and test their value. Finally we will seek to sum up the discussion and to arrive at a right decision on the point at issue, viz., the reliability or otherwise of the Divine Names as given in the Massoretic text.

Part II. *The Septuagint.*

1. *The history of the LXX and the present condition of its text.* *

i. According to 'the letter of Aristeas' the Pentateuch was translated into Greek in Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.). Even though this document is not in all respects trustworthy, the date cannot be very far wrong. This translation was clearly intended to supply the needs of the Alexandrian synagogue, the Jews of Egypt being Greek-speaking and no longer conversant with Biblical Hebrew. The Law only at this time was fully canonical and the translation of it would be made

* See Swete's Introduction, Part I; Driver on text of Samuel, pp. xl.–lxxxii.; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, Lect. IV and V.

under a strong sense of responsibility. The Greek Pentateuch accordingly "is on the whole a close and serviceable translation." (Other parts of the Old Testament were translated at different times and with different ideals, the process being completed in all probability before the Christian era. But with these we have not to deal in this article.) There are palæographical reasons for thinking that the Pentateuch was translated from a Hebrew text written in archaic characters. (See Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. lxv.)

ii. The original text of the LXX had suffered corruptions before the Christian era. Philo's quotations are sufficient evidence of this (Swete, pp. 372–6). It had deteriorated still further by the time of Origen. Efforts were therefore made to revise it. At Cæsarea Origen, at Antioch Lucian, and in Egypt Hesychius endeavoured to restore the text to its original purity. But this only added to the confusion. Origen sought to correct it by comparison with the Hebrew text of his day. When he found in the LXX words which had no equivalent in the Hebrew, he left them in and marked them with obeli (– , with or without dots above and below); when words were wanting, he added them (generally from one of the later versions), marking them with asterisks (*). This recension was often copied without the signs and often mixed with other recensions. Fortunately it is still to be found in a relatively pure form and with the signs in the uncials G, M, in a few cursives and especially in the Syro-hexaplar version (Swete, pp. 59–78).

Lucian (with Dorotheus, who was a Hebrew, as well as a Greek, scholar) revised the LXX, in all probability, on the same principles as governed the Antiochene revision of the New Testament. His main aim seems to have been lucidity and completeness, but he also consulted the Hebrew text current in Syria in the third century A.D., and this

seems to have differed in a number of places from the text which lay before the Alexandrian translators five centuries before (Swete, pp. 80–85).

Hesychius about the same time revised the current LXX text for the Egyptian Church. This recension is probably represented fairly well by the text of codex Q (Prophets only), and certain cursives. Ceriani has shown that this text agrees closely with the text underlying the Egyptian versions and that which is reflected in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria.

The result of all this was not satisfactory. In Jerome's time men read their Old Testament in one or other of these three recensions according to their country of residence. As time went on these texts became fused in varying proportions in different manuscripts. Groups of MSS. are recognizable to-day, which seem to answer more or less to this recension or that, but the greater number present mixed texts, which almost defy analysis.*

iii. When we pass from MSS. to the versions made from the LXX and not direct from the Hebrew, we find valuable guidance towards the recovery of the original Greek Text, but here too the fusion of different types of text greatly complicates the problem. When, e.g., Dr. Swete tries to group the authorities which are generally supposed to represent the three recensions, he has to include the Armenian version as 'in part' belonging to all three! *The Old Latin* is pre-hexaplaric and in general of great value, but in regard to the names of God, its evidence is unreliable, owing to the tendency to confuse the Latin contractions (Dn̄s and Ds̄) for Dominus and Deus (see Prof. Burkitt's *The Rules of Tyconius*, p. lix. and very many pages of the text). *The Egyptian versions* probably reflect

* See article on "The Classification of Greek MSS. of the Hexateuch," by Dr. A. V. Billen (*J.T.S.*, April, 1925).

the Hesychian revision, but "much yet remains to be done before these versions can be securely used in the work of reconstructing the text of the Greek Old Testament" (Swete, p. 108). *The Ethiopic version* again is valuable, but Lagarde maintained that "the printed texts [did not] furnish a secure basis for the employment of this version for the reconstruction of the LXX" (Swete, p. 110). *The Syro-hexaplar* is "an exact reflection in Syriac of the Hexaplaric Greek text, as read at Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century" (Swete, p. 114). *The Armenian version* "shows a typical hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus" (McLean in Swete, p. 119). *The Palestinian Aramaic* resembles in its literal character the last two versions.

iv. The last helps to textual reconstruction of the LXX are quotations in Jewish writers (Philo and Josephus), the N.T. and the writings of Christian Fathers of the first four or five centuries, especially, (in Greek) Justin, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria and (in Latin) Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, Lucifer, Tyconius and Latin translations of Origen. The unsatisfactory state of the text of most editions of the Fathers, their habit of quoting inexactly from memory and of weaving together different passages and the influence of familiar quotations in the New Testament make it extremely difficult to be sure of the exact value of particular patristic quotations. A knowledge of the context is often vitally important.

The extent of the internal variant readings revealed by the collation of MSS., versions and quotations may be gauged in some measure by the fact that, if we take the list of variants recorded in the apparatus criticus of the larger Cambridge LXX, we find that out of 1,530 verses in Genesis only 3 have been copied, translated and quoted without variation by these various authorities. These

verses are $1^{1,19}$ and 21^{24} and contain 10, 8 and 5 words respectively. It is therefore to be expected that this tendency to error should show itself in the transmission, translation and quotation of the Divine Names as well as in the rest of the Greek Text. And as a matter of fact this is very much the case. In the MT the variants for the Names of God in MSS. and versions (apart from the LXX) are extremely rare. "In the Greek Pentateuch perhaps no element of the text is so liable to variation as the names for God." In Gen. 1^{1} to Ex. 3^{15a} out of 350 uses of the Names (as proper names) in the LXX, separately or in combination, only 90 have no internal variants, while the remaining 260 have from one to three or four variants.

2. *A tentative statement of the witness of the LXX as to the use of the Divine Names.*

The perusal of the foregoing very condensed statements of the history and present condition of the LXX and of the materials available for its reconstruction will show to an attentive reader that the task before the Critic, who seeks to ascertain the true Text of the original LXX version of the Pentateuch, is an extremely difficult and delicate one. So difficult is it that no scholar or group of scholars has yet ventured to produce a critically revised text of the original LXX. That great Textual scholar, Lagarde, before his lamented death did produce the first volume (Gen.–Esther) of a provisional text of one recension (Lucian's), but he was careful to disclaim the idea that his work was final and Swete warns us against quoting Lagarde's text as 'Lucian' without reserve. Even if it were satisfactorily 'Lucian,' the final goal would still be far off. As Lagarde wrote in his preface, "the restoration of the text common to any one family must not be regarded as more than a step forward in the right direction, and even a critical text, when reached by these or other means,

will not be free from the element of uncertainty " (see Swete, p. 485). But extremely difficult though it be, the scholar, who would use the LXX as a witness to the Hebrew Text underlying it, is compelled (until such a critically revised text is put forward by men who have given their lives to the study) to come to some tentative conclusions of his own as to what was probably the original text. Here it is only possible to state the results at which the present writer has arrived in the most summary manner. Footnotes giving references will enable the reader to check these results. The evidence upon which they are based is set forth fully in the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

Taking the 344 occurrences of the Divine Names as proper names in the MT of Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15a} we find that in 266 cases the Greek translation agrees with the MT, in 53 it almost certainly differs from it, and in 25 the evidence is so conflicting that, at present, certainty is hardly possible. Moreover in the LXX we find 7 clear, and 2 doubtful, additional occurrences of ὁ Θεός and 2 additional of Κύριος. Deduct from these the 5 omissions included in the 53 clear differences mentioned above and we arrive at the total of 350 Divine Names in the LXX as compared with 344 in the MT.*

The Table on p. 180 shows the number of occurrences of each name in the MT and the corresponding readings in the LXX.

Bearing in mind what we have learnt about

I. The Massoretic Text and II. The Septuagintal Text, we must now confront the one with the other and seek to ascertain

* The total occurrences of the Divine Names in MT and in LXX may be summarized as follows. We find in the MT 178 Elohim, 146 Yahweh and 20 Yahweh Elohim, total 344; in the LXX 193 ὁ θεός (including 2 doubtful additions), 1 θεοί (Gen. 3^{5}), 99 κύριος, 32 κύριος ὁ θεός, 25 doubtful, total 350.

	MT				Not in MT
Yahweh .	146	Elohim	178	Yahweh Elohim	20	
			LXX			
κύριος . .	93	. .	4 *	. . . .	0	2
ὁ θεός . .	19 †	. .	160 ‡	. . . .	5 §	? 9
θεοί		. .	1 ‖			
κύριος ὁ θεός	16 ¶	. .	4 **	. . . .	12	
omitted . .	1 ††	. .	4 ‡‡	. . . .	0	
doubtful .	17 §§	. .	5 ‖‖	. . . .	3 ¶¶	
	146		178		20	11

III. The comparative merits of the two Texts.

Has the LXX in the Pentateuch been translated from a purer text than the MT, or the reverse? Or does it represent essentially the same Hebrew Text, its differences being due in the main to translational or transcriptional errors?

1. There are four points of a general character which deserve preliminary consideration.

(i) In the case of the MT we have a text in the original language, whereas in the case of the LXX we have to deal with a version in another tongue. The MT is written in the later Aramaic script, but evidently in the Pentateuch it was transliterated from the earlier Hebrew script with scrupulous care. In the LXX we have to deal with differences of thought and idiom, and transcriptional probabilities

* Gen. 19^{29a}, $21^{2,6}$, Ex. 3^{4b}.

† Gen. $4^{1,4,16}$, $6^{6,7}$, $13^{10a\ \&\ b,13}$, $15^{6,7}$, 16^{5}, $18^{1,14}$, 25^{21b}, $30^{24,27}$, 31^{49}, $38^{7b,10}$.

‡ including θεοσέβαια for 'fear of God' (20^{11}).

§ Gen. $2^{5,7,9,19,21}$.

‖ Gen. 3^{5}.

¶ Gen. $4^{6,15a\ \&\ b,26}$, 5^{29}, $6^{3,5,8}$, $7^{1,5,16b}$, $8^{21a\ \&\ b}$, 10^{9a}, 11^{9b}, 29^{31}.

** Gen. 6^{12}, 8^{15}, 9^{12}, 28^{20}.

†† Gen. 14^{22}.

‡‡ Gen. 1^{28}, 9^{16}, 31^{50b}, Ex. 2^{25b}.

§§ Gen. $4^{3,9,13}$, 8^{20}, 10^{9b}, $11^{8,9a}$, 12^{17}, $13^{4,14}$, $15^{4,18}$, 16^{7}, 24^{40}, 26^{2}, 28^{13b}, 32^{9}.

‖‖ Gen. 6^{22}, $7^{9,16a}$. 21^{4}, Ex. 3^{1}.

¶¶ Gen. 2^{4b}, $3^{13,22}$.

vary in the two languages. This last fact is well exemplified in the case of the two Divine Names.

(ii) In Hebrew the two Divine Names are sharply distinguished, the one being purely a proper name and the other a generic (or common or appellative) name, used as a proper name in particular cases. But, at the time when the LXX translation was made, the sacred name of four letters had ceased to be pronounced and the reader of Scripture habitually substituted the word Adonai (i.e. Lord). (In the rare cases where Adonai preceded Yahweh he substituted Elohim.) Where therefore the Hebrew text was YHWH, the Greek translator as a rule translated by κύριος (or sometimes ὁ κύριος), and where the Hebrew word was Elohim, he translated by ὁ θεός. But κύριος and θεός (Lord and God) are both common nouns in Greek and therefore, while the Jew who knew Hebrew knew well what κύριος stood for, the ordinary Greek-speaking individual did not. He would tend to class them together as synonyms and would not regard it as of great importance whether the one name or the other stood in a particular passage. It is obvious therefore that the possibility of substituting one name for the other would be greater in the case of the Greek copyist than in that of the Hebrew.

(iii) In most cases in which we have to decide between the claims of rival variant readings, the Textual critic is able to call in the help of 'intrinsic probability'; one reading seems to make better sense than its rival or rivals. But in the case of the Divine Names this can rarely, if ever, be done. Taking a sentence in isolation from the context, one name makes as good sense as the other. It is only when one of the speakers is a non-Israelite that there is intrinsic probability in favour of Elohim rather than Yahweh, and in such passages there is no difference between MT and LXX. I exclude for the moment the question of the

accompanying phraseology and of possible different documents in which different Divine Names are used. If these be considered, intrinsic probability has more to say.*

(iv) The possible variants are strictly limited. If a scribe went astray in copying a Divine Name, he could only substitute Elohim for Yahweh, or *vice versa*, or put the two names together. Out of 344 uses of one or other name, or both names together, in MT it is transcriptionally not improbable that an ordinary copyist would make one or more accidental errors of this kind in a given MS., and it is obvious that, when the range of possible alternatives is so small, if two copyists (say one Hebrew and one Greek, or a Greek Father quoting the passage) did go wrong at the same place, the errors they made would in most cases coincide. As a matter of fact, in a large proportion of cases, both, sometimes all three, alternatives are found in LXX MSS., daughter-versions or quotations, and therefore there is an exceedingly good chance that, when a Hebrew MS. differs from the MT, it will find some kind of support in the LXX. "In all but two (1^{28}, 19^{29a}) of the twenty-two actual instances [in Genesis] of agreement (against the MT) between Hebrew and Greek MSS., the Massoretic reading is also represented in MSS. of the LXX and in the vast majority of cases far more strongly attested than the variant" (Dr. Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 103–4). This being so, the argument from the agreement between occasional Hebrew MSS. and LXX MSS. is practically worthless.

J. Battersby Harford.

(*This article will be continued in next month's issue.*)

* See 2 vi below.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

THERE have been hundreds of books written and thousands of sermons preached on the subject of the Sabbath, but it is remarkable how little of fresh teaching there is given about it. The same ideas and almost the same language have been served up year after year and age after age. Sabbath observance is generally considered to be on much the same level as temperance : it is the fad of the enthusiast, but is coldly regarded as unessential by ordinary people. There has probably been more false argument used and more nonsense uttered on behalf of the Sabbath than upon any other question upon which religious people have felt themselves compelled to speak. There is no subject in the whole field of religious thought and conduct which needs more dispassionate and scientific study than this subject. Here it is more than anywhere else that scholarship has shown its wide divergence from ordinary thinking. Scholars have often forgotten that their work is done for the benefit of the rank and file of religious people. And so they have published their work in books that the generality of people do not buy, and in language that the generality of people do not understand. On the other hand, the rank and file of religious people have forgotten, or indeed perhaps have never even heard, that scholarship has any voice on this matter, and so they go on writing their articles, preaching their sermons, and conducting their campaigns, on the assumption that they are carrying out a Biblical programme, which is, however, in all probability, not Biblical at all. On this question knowledge is more than half the battle.

The first thing that we need to notice is the fact that we have different stories in the Old Testament concerning the

instituting of the Sabbath Day. The Pentateuch did not come from the hand of Moses, but gradually came into being in the process of the centuries. Some stories, such as those of the Creation and the Flood, are related more than once, and, in some respects, the accounts differ from each other. The reason is that stories were current in different forms in Israel, that collections of them came together, and that when the Pentateuch was finally compiled, the editors included different versions of the same stories, some early, some late, without taking it upon themselves to discriminate between them. That will not sound so very remarkable when it is remembered that it was in just that way that nearly all ancient history was written.

There are references to the Sabbath in all sections of the Old Testament, and we will look at them, so far as is possible, in proper chronological order. The oldest references that we can find are in Exodus xxxiv. 21, xxiii. 12, xx. 8 ff., and Deuteronomy v. 12 ff. The last two form part of the Decalogue strictly so called. The second is an isolated reference. Of the first we shall have to speak later. They all read as follows:—

Exodus xxxiv. 21: "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest."

Exodus xxiii. 12: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the stranger may be refreshed."

Exodus xx. 8 ff: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is in thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in

them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Deuteronomy v. 12 ff.: "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Now, although these accounts differ from one another in the details (and one of the points of difference will be examined in due course), yet it is important to notice that there is solid agreement over some of the essentials. They are these:—

(1) It is the seventh day that is to be kept as the Sabbath.

(2) We see clearly that, even though these notices are the earliest that we have, yet they reflect a relatively late period in the history of Israel. The Israelites began as wandering peoples. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were Bedouin sheikhs. Gradually, they ceased their wanderings and settled down to a stable agricultural life. As addressed to nomads, the command to rest on the seventh day is useless and almost meaningless. They can rest when they like, and they have no need of a legal holiday. Moreover, what work they do for a living, feeding the cattle, milking and so on, has to be done every day, whether it is a legal holiday or not. But when men settle down to an agricultural life, their work is hard and long, and a day's rest now and again is a necessity.

It was to an agricultural, and not to a nomadic, people that the commandment first came.

(3) The commandment only demands rest from daily toil. It demands no more. It does not forbid pleasure. It does not command worship. The demand, moreover, is human. Not only masters, but servants and cattle as well, are to enjoy the rest from work. Men are expected to obey the law on unselfish grounds. In fact, it looks as if in process of time the command was amplified deliberately to show that servants and animals were to rest as well as masters. Many Sabbatarian Jews were much like many Sabbatarian Christians. Their conscience pricked when they worked themselves, but not when their servants worked for them. It does not mean, of course, that the day had no religious significance, for it had. But primarily, the law is humanitarian ; it is a law commanding that those who labour shall have the chance to rest. In the early days of Israel, as we can see from the historical books (cf. Exod. xxiii. and 2 Kings iv. 23), and the early prophets (cf. Amos viii. 5), the Sabbath was associated with the new moon and the agricultural festivals as a day of gladness, rest and sacred feasting.

So much for the earliest stages of the Sabbath institution. In the seventh century before Christ, the glad and buoyant elements in connection with it began to fall away. The local sanctuaries were abolished, and, for most people, the rites and ceremonies which had been an indissoluble part of all the sacred festivals, became things of the past. The majority of the feasts began to be forgotten. But in the general decline of religious life the Sabbath as a day of rest kept its place, and was even able to survive the Captivity. During the Captivity, it was zealously observed as one of the few remaining outward signs by which men's devotion to Yahweh could be tested. When we remember this, we can understand a little the importance which later prophets and

legislators attached to it. Jeremiah, for example, just before the Exile, chided the people for their negligence of the Sabbath, and asserted that, if only they would faithfully keep it, God's favour would return to Jerusalem, and the city would be safe. He said, "Bear no burden on the Sabbath day, neither bring in by the gates of Jerusalem, nor carry forth a burden out of your houses, nor do any business, but hallow ye the Sabbath day." Isaiah also, during the Exile, promised the people great blessings if only they would keep the Sabbath faithfully. "If thou turn thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day (i.e., if they will spend the Sabbath in rest, and not follow their ordinary occupation), if thou do that, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable, and shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the field and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father." That is, the observance of the Sabbath is a typical religious act. By it, loyalty to Yahweh is tested, and, because of it, the people of Israel shall be restored to their own land.

After the Exile, the law about the Sabbath became much more severe. In the book of Nehemiah, for example, we find the people of Jerusalem pledging themselves not to buy wares or food on the Sabbath day if they were offered for sale by a foreigner (apparently they would not be offered for sale by a Jew), and on a later occasion, when it was discovered that the people had not kept faithful to their pledge, and that other work was going on besides the buying and selling of goods, the gates of the city were closed against merchants, and the law of the land was used to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath.

Later legislation was even more severe. The priests

tightened up the Code. The humanitarian idea in the fourth commandment was lost sight of, and theological ideas came in. The Sabbath day was modelled on the pattern of the rest of God after the Creation, and was in accordance with the whole constitution of the universe. In Exodus xxxi. 15, a very late piece of writing, we have the commandment given in this form : "Six days may work be done ; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord : whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death."

Thus we see that even in the Old Testament, we have not a uniform system of legislation about the Sabbath. We find it beginning as a day of rest and delight, with a spirit of kindness and good fellowship behind it, and gradually coming into the hands of the priests until its first intention is lost, and it becomes an almost purely ceremonial institution, supported by the very severest laws. When Jesus said that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, He was giving utterance to a sound historical truth, as well as propounding a dictum of mercy and common sense.

Of the later history of the Sabbath before the New Testament period, little is to be said. There are a few references to it in the Apocryphal writings, which show how tenaciously the Jews held to the letter of the law. On more than one occasion, they submitted to massacre rather than fight to protect themselves on the Sabbath, and the Romans were not slow to take advantage of it, and planned and carried through enterprises of war on that day because they knew they would be free from attack.

By the later Rabbis, the laws about the Sabbath were collected and annotated and systematized with such a minuteness of detail that they have justly received the contempt of all sensible people ever since. There was one thing,

however, that the Jews never forgot. The Sabbath was not meant to be a day of fasting, and it was never made into a day of fasting. Indeed they rather regarded it as a time of family reunions and family parties. Their laws forbade work : they did not forbid any and every form of recreation. The Jews never lost sight of that. So much so did they remember it, in fact, that they were often taunted by the early Christian Fathers for the luxurious and self-indulgent manner in which they kept the Sabbath. They had ingenious methods by which they should ensure the happiness of the Sabbath and yet keep the law. Cooking, and lighting and attending fires were all forbidden, but at the same time it was the rule that there should be at least three meals during the day, at which should be eaten the very choicest available food. The meals were cooked on Friday evening, and the Jews knew of methods whereby the food could be kept warm for hours, and should be ready for eating when required.

The schools of the Rabbis were divided among themselves about the meaning of work. They formulated minute precepts, touching all sorts of activities, which make their writings very little more than a source of amusement to modern students of the Sabbath. One law, for example, said that the limit for the Sabbath day's journey was two thousand cubits, but that was not clear enough for them. If anybody wished to go beyond that distance, he could easily evade the law. All he had to do was to deposit beforehand food sufficient for two meals at the end of the stage, and he could, for the time being, consider that to be his dwelling-place, and travel another two thousand cubits beyond it. There is no need to pursue these intricacies any further. They may, however, serve as a warning to us. There are good solid Christians who are almost equally finicking in the things they sanction on Sunday, and who

show an equal subtlety in dodging round the laws they have laid down for themselves.

So much for the preliminary examination into the history of the Sabbath. But in that examination, we have shelved some very difficult problems to which we must now turn.

The Decalogue is of tremendous educational value. It has left an indelible impression on Jewish religion and on the life of the race. It behoves us therefore to make an effort to understand it. We have been in the habit of recognizing two versions of it, that in Exodus xx., and that in Deuteronomy v. With regard to most of the commandments, the differences between the two versions are small and unimportant. But in the case of the Fourth commandment, the differences are great and vital. Apart from differences of isolated words, there is the radical difference between the two reasons given why the commandment should be kept. In the one case, the reason given is that the Sabbath is on the pattern of God's rest at the Creation ; in the other, the reason given is that it is to remind the children of Israel that God had brought them out of Egypt. Which is right ? When was the Sabbath instituted ?

It is very attractive, in many ways, to think of the Sabbath as being instituted at the creation of the world. The stories in the early chapters of Genesis are lovely stories. The idea of an almighty God knocking a world into shape, never allowing it to rest until after His six days work was finished, and then, at the end of His toil, leaving it to its rest, is certainly a very beautiful idea. But a good many stories are beautiful and yet are not true. The theory that the Sabbath was instituted then is a theory that has much to support it in the documents, as they stand. Only recently, the view has been put forward by a Jewish scholar that the main idea in the Jewish mind was that the Sabbath was kept

in commemoration of the seventh day of rest after the six days of creating, and that the creative activity of God was the main idea in Jewish theological thought.

But against all that some very powerful arguments can be raised.

(1) We have first of all the rather staggering fact that, if the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, then everybody forgot about it immediately afterwards until the time of Moses. There is not the faintest trace of a suggestion that any of the Patriarchs kept the seventh day or indeed any day as a Sabbath, either for the purpose of rest or for that of worship. So far as our evidence goes, they drew no distinction whatever between the various days of the week.

(2) Then also we have the fact that such a command at such a time would have no meaning. It would have no meaning for Adam, even if we take for granted the literal accuracy of the Creation story. It would be merely an arbitrary enactment on the part of God. It would have no bearing on Adam's moral and social life. His work and rest would depend upon his physical capabilities : there was, *ex hypothesi*, no society for him to consider. Moreover, the Sabbath day as part of a theological system would mean nothing. God's laws are always related to something in the human heart. A law commanding rest in commemoration of God's work and rest has no point of contact with either primitive or educated man. Further, even if Adam did receive such a commandment, it by no means follows that it would be binding upon us. Jesus had a good deal to say about the Sabbath, and what He said is more important for us than what Adam may have believed. If Jesus gave us a higher revelation than that given in the law and the prophets, He certainly went far beyond anything that preceded the law and the prophets.

(3) Further, Jewish tradition is solidly for the fact that

the deliverance from Egypt and the Sabbath are bound up together. That does not mean, of necessity, that the Sabbath was instituted at the time of the deliverance, but it does mean that the Jews honoured the Sabbath mainly as a sign of gratitude to God for the deliverance. It has been urged by some writers on this matter that the national and temporary reason for the Sabbath assigned in the Deuteronomic version of the Decalogue is an after thought, and that the original and essential reason lies in the very creation of the human family. That argument strikes one as being very unnatural, and as being based upon a narrow and blind reading of human history. Institutions are generally in being long before explanations are given of them. They spring from very simple instincts, and the first explanations given of them are very naïve. Before the theological explanation given in the Exodus version could have been arrived at, men must have done a lot of thinking on the nature and work of God. Generally speaking, the simplest interpretation of any custom is the earliest.

Moreover, the connection between the Sabbath and the deliverance from Egypt is much closer in Jewish thought than that between the Sabbath and the Creation. Ordinary people in Israel at any period before Christ were very much the same as ordinary people in Palestine are now, simple, superstitious and idolatrous. Facts meant more to them than theories. Even the thinkers in Israel speak little of God as creator of the earth. Certainly, in isolated cases, the thought of God's creative work is set forth in wonderful and beautiful language, but the main emphasis is not put there. What Old Testament thought revolves round is the deliverance from Egypt. It was then that the children of Israel discovered their soul and their national consciousness. It was then that tradition told them that Yahweh had revealed Himself as Israel's God. Yahweh was different from the

other national Gods. Chemosh belonged to Moab, and Moab belonged to Chemosh. Moab could not get on without Chemosh, but neither could Chemosh get on without Moab. In the case of Israel, the relationship was different. Israel belonged to Yahweh, and could not get on without Yahweh. Yahweh, in a sense, belonged to Israel, but He could get on without Israel. He had deliberately chosen out Israel from among the nations as the sheer expression of His love. He could cast Israel off. He could chastise her. He could send her through the fire. But His love would yearn over her, as does the love of a husband over a faithless wife, to use the vivid picture of Hosea, and He would bring her back. The deliverance from Egypt was the expression of Yahweh's extravagant, and utterly unrequited love. That thought lay at the foundation of every Jewish moral and theological conception. The mere fact of the creation of the world meant little. The Sabbath was a delight to the Jew whenever he remembered the goodness of God. When the Sabbath was neglected, it was because God's gracious dealing with Israel in history was beginning to be forgotten.

(4) But the most important reason is that the Fourth commandment shows signs of being changed in form and language in the process of the years. This went on in the case of all the commandments, but the steps are more obvious in the case of the Fourth than in the case of any other. The whole point of the Decalogue originally was that it should be a collection of short, sharp, epigrammatic commandments. Now if we compare the two versions of the Fourth commandment, and take away the explanations, we get just that clear brevity which is the essential in primitive legal codes. When first the Sabbath law read as the law of the Sabbath, it read like this: Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. There was no more in it than

that. Both the thought of the deliverance from Egypt and that of creation are after-thoughts. But even that presupposes that the institution of the Sabbath was already known.

Modern research has got beyond the two versions of the Decalogue that are generally recognized, to a third. This is to be found in Exodus xxxiv. Scholars differ in their reconstructions, but the earliest form of the Decalogue was probably as follows :—

(1) Thou shalt worship no other God.

(2) Thou shalt make thee no molten Gods.

(3) The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep.

(4) Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest.

(5) Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks.

(6) Thou shalt observe the feast of the ingathering at the year's end.

(7) Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.

(8) The fat of my feast shall not remain all night until the morning.

(9) The first of the firstfruits of the ground thou shalt bring into the house of Yahweh thy God.

(10) Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.

We need not feel ourselves compelled to swear to every item of this primitive code of law, to be able to pronounce it earlier than either of the two Decalogues we have generally recognized, even when the latter have been stripped of their additions and explanations. The priority is obvious on the surface. The commandments are related to the life of a primitive people and refer to the simple religious life of such a people. There is hardly any of the moral and theological teaching such as we find in the later versions. And yet in spite of its primitive character, it presupposes the settlement

of Israel in Canaan. The nation has already adopted the life of agriculture. There are three festivals devoted to husbandry alone. That is certain proof that the Decalogue could not have been instituted at Creation. It looks almost as if it could not have come from Moses.

But the Hebrew Sabbath cannot be understood if it is studied by itself. It must be studied in its relation to the whole Hebrew religious system. To start with, it is quite a unique institution. Other peoples, of course, have suspension from daily work in connexion with religious festivals. Almost universally, a holiday has been regarded as one of the best ways of expressing reverence for God. Other peoples also besides the Hebrews reckoned time by means of the week. Probably the week originated in Babylon in connection with astrology, but very soon it began to be used as a civil division of time. From Babylon it rapidly spread over Europe, Western Asia and Egypt. But so far as we know, the institution of the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship on the seventh day of the week is peculiar to the Hebrews.

But we need not be too eager to emphasize that particular uniqueness. Although for the Jews, it was the seventh day and not any other day that had to be consecrated, yet, as an institution for humanity, it does not matter greatly what day is set aside for the service of the gods, so long as some day is. If the Hebrews alone had ordered periodic days of rest, and if they alone had reckoned time by the week, then we could hardly take the idea seriously. What is said to be revealed only to one people can hardly be considered to be binding upon all, or fitted to the needs of all. It is because so many peoples in all parts of the world have set aside special days as days of rest that we can consider the institution as fitting to human needs. What is peculiar to the Hebrews is what they put into the Sabbath. In course of

time, the day of rest grew to mean to them what it never grew to mean to anybody else. They found in it what no other people found. What made the Hebrews' Sabbath different from any other nation's Sabbath was the fact that the Hebrews' God was different from any other nation's God. There were associations gathered round the name Yahweh that were gathered round no other name. It was not by speculation, but by practical experience of Him as a living and active person, that the Hebrews came to believe in Yahweh as the only God. Yahweh, even at the beginning of Israel's history, was a separate God, all by Himself, like no other God. Israel was a separate people, in a class alone, like no other people. It is this idea of separateness that underlies the whole Jewish conception of religion, and it is this idea that gives distinction to the Jewish conception of the Sabbath.

We are told in one version of the Fourth commandment that the Sabbath was to be kept holy, and the word " holy " gives us the clue to what we are looking for. Originally, whether it was applied to God, men or things, it had no moral quality whatever attached to it. Naturally, when applied to things, it could have no moral quality. It could obviously have only ceremonial quality. When applied to men, it meant belonging to the gods, set apart for their service and use, but that service might be, from a moral standpoint, either good, bad or indifferent. When applied to God, it emphasized His power rather than His character. God could be good or bad. He could be reasonable or unreasonable. He could be pure or licentious. He could be loving or cruel. But in so far as He was God and not man, he was holy. That means He was set apart, isolated, untouchable, taboo. In primitive religion generally, we find the idea of holiness attaching to God and all men and things belonging to God, and the meaning of holi-

ness is that of separation, prohibition, strange and unknown powers, awful possibilities, superstitious dreads. The Ark of the Lord is holy. Why? Because there is something morally good in it? No, but because, if you touch it, you run the danger of being struck dead. Saul was the Lord's anointed, and therefore David would not touch him. Why? Because he knew it was wrong to kill? Not a bit of it. It was not wrong, but dangerous, to touch the king. Thus, in primitive times, the idea belonging to the word holy was the idea of physical untouchableness. Yahweh was holy, because He was beyond the reach and understanding of men. And everything belonging to Yahweh was holy, His name, His temple, His land, His priests, His day, because it was dangerous to use them for a purpose other than He commanded.

That is how the idea of holiness began, but it did not end there. Through the thinking and praying of prophets, men began to see deeper into the nature of God. The predominantly physical elements in the idea of His holiness began to be forgotten until the elements in it became predominantly moral. Gradually His separateness was seen to be a separateness from sin. And with that development, there was development also in the idea of the holiness of Yahweh's belongings. At first, vessels in the temple were regarded as holy, because they were used exclusively in the service of Yahweh, but in time they came to be regarded as holy because of their associations. At first the Sabbath was regarded as holy, because it was regarded as being set aside from the other days of the week as belonging to Yahweh, but in process of time it came to be regarded as holy because of its sacred associations.

This idea of separateness runs right the way through Hebrew religion. The relation between Israel and Yahweh was a covenant relation. They bound themselves to each

other, and they had a right in each other. The traditions are absolutely unanimous about the fact of the covenant, although exaggeration and fable may have been freely used. The love of Israel and Yahweh was a love of free choice, and so the relationship was moral, rather than natural, and that made it possible for the covenant idea to be filled up and moralized with the growth of moral and religious thought. But the important fact is, that there was a covenant. This facilitated the advance of Israel out of naturalism into a pure ethical atmosphere. Israel was to be a theocracy. It was not the wise or the rich or the powerful or the majority who were to rule, but Yahweh. Yahweh was to be supreme king in all departments of Israel's life. That on God's part. On Israel's part, the nation pledged herself to live to the honour and glory of Yahweh, to obey His will and defend His laws. She was an isolated nation. And she had duties belonging to her isolation. In that sacred nation, a sacred family was set apart, that the nation might draw near to God through them. The high priest was set apart. He symbolized the nation's devotion to Yahweh. He bore the names of the twelve tribes on his breast. The temple was set apart to symbolize the fact that all buildings belonged to God. The first-born son was dedicated to God to show that the manhood of the nation belonged to Him. The first-fruits of the harvest and the firstlings of the cattle were given to God to show that the increase of the land was due to Him. The seventh day of each week was set apart as a day on which no work was to be done ; the seventh year was set aside as a year during which no seed should be sown ; in the seventh month of the fiftieth year, there should be freedom for all, the whole land should have rest, all debts should be cancelled, the land should be returned to its original owners, and all slaves should be sent away free. Underlying the whole of

this peculiar system of legislation was the fixed assumption that everything in Israel belonged to Yahweh, land, harvest, cattle, buildings, men, time. The sanctity of special days and men and places was not an intrinsic sanctity : it was a sanctity belonging to them because they were symbolically the offering of all the members of their class to God.

We sometimes hear it said that the idea of the Sabbath originally was that it was merely a day of rest. But this is to misinterpret entirely the mind of primitive peoples. For them, humanitarian motives would have no binding force, unless backed up by religious authority. Nearly all institutions in the primitive world have religious sanctions. The demand of rest is certainly contained in the idea of the Hebrew Sabbath, but rest is demanded because it is considered to be an act of worship. It is still the religious factor that is uppermost.

In the study of the Sabbath from the historical standpoint, there is only one more question that needs examination, and that is its relationship with the Christian Sunday. In the history of the Christian Church, there have been many different ways of regarding the relationship. Some have said that the Fourth Commandment, even when it was promulgated, was intended to be nothing more than a temporary expedient. Others have argued that the Sabbath has passed away in every sense of the word. Others have said that it is still binding upon everybody, upon the seventh day of the week. The mere statement of those views is enough to condemn them. There are only two views that are worth examination. One is that the Christian Sunday is the representative of the Jewish Sabbath, that it depends upon the Fourth Commandment for its sanction, but that it has eliminated from the institution all that is of a specifically Jewish character. The other is that Sunday as a day of rest and worship exists by its own right, that it has

nothing whatever to do with the Sabbath, but has an origin and *motif* purely of its own.

That the second view is right must be acknowledged by any fair-minded student of history. To show that, we will put the two institutions, in their leading features, side by side.

(1) The Sabbath purports to be celebrated in obedience to a definite divine commandment. It is enforced in both versions of the Decalogue, in the documents that lie at the back of the Decalogue, and throughout the Old Testament. It is protected by the civil arm. On the other hand, in the New Testament, the observance of Sunday as a day of rest, or indeed in any particular way, is not enforced by a single word or suggestion.

(2) The Sabbath is commanded to be kept on the seventh day. It could not be kept on any other day. To observe the first day of the week or the fourth is not to observe the Sabbath. With Christians, it is the first day that is honoured. It has often been said that in this commandment the seventh day can mean any day in the seven. Sabbatarians often adopt that form of argument. The Puritans largely adopted it. But it is the argument of despair. The system of reckoning time by the week is an old system : it was not originated by the Hebrews. It was the last day of the week, after six days of work, that was to be kept holy. The observance of no other day would fulfil the law.

(3) According to the dominant attitude in the Old Testament, the Sabbath was observed in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt. Such a motive means nothing to the Christian. We observe Sunday in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection from the dead.

(4) At first, there seems to have been no penalty for violation of the Sabbath. But after the Exile the penalty of death was exacted. In the New Testament, and indeed for

a long time after the New Testament period, no penalty whatever was exacted for desecrating the Lord's day. To those who are strict believers in the literal accuracy of the Scriptures, this argument ought to be sufficient. For those who have learned to read the Scriptures critically, it has not the same force. The nature of the Sabbath changed in history. And the nature of Sunday has changed in history. Sabbatarian tendencies have crept in, as strict and as ridiculous as any that the Rabbis were guilty of. A code of laws, for example, was drawn up for the state of Massachusetts by one of the Pilgrim Fathers forbidding many things on Sunday and saying this specifically :—

"Whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day by doing any unnecessary work, by unnecessary travelling or by sports and recreations, he or they who so transgress shall forfeit forty shillings, or be publicly whipped ; but if it shall appear to have been done presumptuously, such person or persons shall be put to death, or otherwise severely punished at the discretion of the court."

(5) The Decalogue forbids work and commands physical rest, and it does nothing more. It does not forbid recreation. It does not command worship. It commands the setting aside of one day to show that the whole week belongs to Yahweh. Jesus did not, by a single syllable, forbid work or command worship on the Sabbath day. In the New Testament, Sunday is regarded as a day of prayer and praise and serious thought. It is not spoken of as a day of physical rest. In fact, it was not a day of physical rest. The early Christians were mostly servants of heathen masters, and they could not take their rest just when they wished. Sunday was secured only when Sabbatarian tendencies had made themselves felt in the Christian Church, and Christianity was powerful enough to affect the legislature.

For those reasons, we have to say that the Sabbath as a Jewish institution has passed away for ever to those who accept the faith of Christ. It is bound up with the whole Jewish system, and, for us, has passed away with that system. Jewish faith and Jewish worship must be studied by Christians as preparatory to, and explanatory of, our own worship and faith, but as a system of binding force to us, it has gone and can never come back. We have Christ as our Saviour and King, and we take our sole ruling from Him. The Lord's Day is not a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath and was never intended to be. The two days have nothing to do with each other. There are only two points of contact between them, and they are by no means peculiar to them. One is that they are both religious, and the other is that they are both weekly institutions. But everything that is characteristic of the Sabbath is of no significance to the Christian, and everything that is characteristic of Sunday is of no significance to the Jew.

And yet, in spite of that, if we, as Christians, were asked to give up the day of rest and worship, we should refuse to do it. As the Jewish faith depended, to a large extent, upon the observance of the Sabbath, so the Christian faith depends, to a large extent, upon the observance of Sunday. That brings us to what is, to us, the most important part of our subject, the question, namely, of the origin and significance of Sunday as the Lord's Day.

The New Testament doctrine is that all things are God's, all time, all wealth, all places, all men, all occupations. No place is sacred, because all places are sacred. No profession is holy, because all professions are holy. No day can be specially sanctified, because all days ought to be sanctified. The idea of special sanctity belonging intrinsically to special places, buildings and days, is a relic of paganism, no matter how valiantly we endeavour to spiritualize the idea of

separateness. If Christians were members only of the Body of Christ, we should not require any special days of worship, because all days would be days of worship.

But though that may be perfectly true as an ideal, it does not follow that it would prove advisable as a practical policy. As an ideal, I believe in trusting everybody: but as a practical policy, I think it advisable to lock up the house at night. As an ideal, I see no harm in preaching sermons and going to church on Friday, or in cooking a dinner and having a round of golf on Sunday. But as a practical policy, I still think that it is advisable to set aside Sunday as a day of rest and worship, when so far as possible, it should be kept free of work and should not be devoted to ordinary recreation. It is not the best way to secure the honouring of all days to begin with the honouring of none. A periodic day of rest is a physical necessity. A periodic day of thought and worship is an intellectual and spiritual necessity. Seeing that Sunday is established in all Christian countries, and has been so established for many centuries, and seeing that the institution fits in well with business, and seems to give body and mind what they both need, it would be an act of folly to endeavour to do away with it. Unfortunately, we are not only members of the Body of Christ. We are members of the world as well, and we have to fit in our arrangements with what the world requires of us. For the whole of Christendom to observe the same day as its religious festival secures a unanimity of thought and method, and avoids that licence and general confusion that would arise if all were free to fix upon their own day. Our duty depends upon our circumstances and the needs of the time. Religion as a power in the world depends, to a large extent, upon public worship, and public worship would be practically impossible were not one day set aside universally for the sake of it.

The New Testament shows clear signs of the first day of the week being used by Christians for purposes of prayer and meditation. There are three pieces of evidence.

(1) In 1 Corinthians xvi. 2 Paul urges that the Christians in Corinth should set aside money for charitable purposes every Sunday. What is of importance here is that the first day of the week is so established in the Church already (it is only about A.D. 55), that Paul can refer to it without explanation.

(2) In Acts xx. 7 we are told that Paul and his companions remained at Troas for seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them. The way this is put seems to show that worship on the first day of the week was a recognized institution.

(3) Much later, the author of the Apocalypse writes, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Here we see that matters have developed so far that the first day of the week can be designated by a particular name.

When the Christians changed from their loyalty to the Sabbath and attached it to the first day of the week is uncertain. Probably the free and liberal attitude of Jesus and Paul helped them somewhat. At first, some kept both days. Some went further. They tried to force Gentile converts to keep the Sabbath. Judaism was to be the doorway into Christianity. Paul resisted the whole tendency with might and main. The religion of Christ was to stand on its own feet. But the early apostles did not violently attack Jewish customs, or forbid their recognition by Christians. There was no violent breach. The old law was allowed to die out, and it was gradually displaced by the new law of Christ.

The reason that the first day of the week was fixed upon by Christians is perfectly plain. It had been endeared to

them by the resurrection of Christ. The Church was born on the day that Jesus rose from the dead. It may be that the weekly Sabbath of the Jews suggested the idea of a weekly religious festival to the Christians, but there was no greater influence than that. They did not devote the whole day to public worship. They could not do that. They met for the most part in secret, when their work was finished, or even before it began. It was only in the course of time, when the Empire became officially Christian, that Sunday was established by law as a day of rest for Christendom.

The important thing about Sunday is what I do, not what I refrain from doing. However the Sabbath began, and whatever its history has been or is destined to be, there are two moral elements enshrined in it. One is that all time belongs to God. The other is that a day of rest and worship is necessary for the physical and spiritual health of the community.

It is a false method to lay down laws for the governance of the Lord's Day. Such laws are mainly a matter for the individual conscience. The real question is not, "What can I do, and yet remain a Christian?" That way lies moral collapse. The real question is not whether I do or do not work on Sunday. Neither is it whether I do or do not play. It is whether I do or do not worship. It is a matter of spirit and attitude. The nice calculation of less and more has no place here.

Sunday perpetuates the remembrance of the fact that we worship a living Saviour. It is an opportunity each week of enjoying that gladness of Easter which shall be perfected only when we dwell with God. Sunday will always be preserved as a day of worship, because it is worth preserving. It is a day of delight and privilege, an opportunity for the liberating of spiritual impulses, a day on which we can share the greatest of all delights, the Rest of the Redeemed.

H. J. Flowers.

THE CRY OF DERELICTION.

The thesis of this discussion is that the cry of Our Lord on the Cross represented by *'Ελωΐ, 'Ελωΐ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί*; was not, as is generally supposed, an appeal to God, but an outburst of desire for the appearing of Elijah.

1. It was so understood by those who were standing by the Cross (Matt. xxvii. 47 ; Mark xv. 35). What the composition of the crowd was we cannot, of course, tell ; but almost certainly it would contain many of those who had been present at the trial, and who would, therefore, be Jews. Consequently, whether the actual cry was uttered in Aramaic or in Hebrew, the bystanders would be quite capable of understanding what Jesus said. The fact that, according to the present reading, they did not understand Him, leads Edersheim—and others with him—to suggest that they were Roman soldiers who had picked up enough religious tradition to account for their subsequent behaviour. To this it should be enough to point out that the other remarks made at the Cross were clearly made by Jews, and that the supposition that the hearing of the bystanders was at fault is based solely on the fact that the cry in the present text is addressed to God and not Elijah.

2. No interpretation, so far given, of the words as they stand is really satisfactory. Dismissing without comment the idea that at that moment Jesus, as the great Substitute, was passing through the terrible experience of feeling the withdrawal of the Father's face in His righteous anger against sin, is there *any* theory in which this cry remains a cry of Divine dereliction that is at all concordant with the Gospel portrait of Jesus ? Not, certainly, the theory that would make it a cry of utter despair. Whatever necessity we may feel for the Saviour's draining to the

dregs the cup of human experience, there is not the slightest hint in all we know of Him to prepare us for such a total eclipse of faith as this. On the contrary, the ordeal of Gethsemane, while revealing a natural shrinking of His soul from what now appeared inevitable, nevertheless discovers Him ready, as always, to do the Father's will, and His bearing throughout the trial and on the way to Golgotha is that of one whose face is steadfastly set to see it through. Nor do we get quite clear of this difficulty when, instead of a cry of despair, we make it, by a reference to the whole of Psalm xxii., a virtual shout of victory. For not even the remainder of the Psalm can alter the fact that it begins—and the beginning is as far as Jesus went—in a cry of desolation, wrung from a troubled if not a shattered faith, and even if Jesus said "*My God, My God,*" He also said "Why hast thou forsaken me?" Moreover, Luke's second word from the Cross, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," must be taken into account. If it is authentic—and it is exactly what we would have expected Jesus to say—how could Jesus so quickly pass from one to the other? Both Matthew and Mark, it is important to notice, place their saying, "at the ninth hour," exactly at the time, when, according to Luke, Jesus commended His spirit to the Father and gave up the ghost. But by no ingenuity of interpretation can He be made, almost at one and the same moment, to have said both.

3. There was a Jewish tradition, mentioned in the Pesikta Rabbati xxxv. 161 (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. v. pp. 126–7, *sub* "Elijah"), to the effect that Elijah would appear *three days* before the coming of the Messiah, and, on the blowing of the Archangel Michael's trumpet, would appear *with* the Messiah and present him to the Jews. It is this same tradition, apparently, to which Edersheim refers in Vol. 11 of his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. There (p. 708), in

his notes on early Rabbinic Elijah tradition, he says: "When, at length, the time of Israel's redemption arrived —then would Elijah return. . . . Whether he came one day (Er. 43 b) or three days before the Messiah (Yalkut, vol. 11, p. 53 c, about the middle) his advent would be close to that of the Messiah. . . . The account given of the three days between the advent of Elijah and of the Messiah is peculiar . . . on the first of those three days Elijah would stand on the mountains of Israel, lamenting the desolateness of the land, his voice being heard from one end of the world to the other, after which he would proclaim: 'Peace' cometh to the world; 'peace' cometh to the world! Similarly on the second day he would proclaim, 'Good' cometh to the world; 'good' cometh to the world! Lastly, on the third day, he would, in the same manner as on the two previous days make proclamation: '*Jeshuah* (salvation) cometh to the world; *Jeshuah* (salvation) cometh to the world,' which, in order to mark the difference between Israel and the Gentiles, would be further explained by this addition: 'Saying unto Zion—Thy King cometh!'"

Now the significance of this tradition for the incident we are considering will appear at once when we recall how persistently Jesus had declared to His disciples that when He had been put to death, "*after three days*" He would rise again, by which, it is clear, He meant that He would be manifested as Israel's Messiah. It is customary to find the ground of Our Lord's phrase in Hosea vi. 2; but that necessitates not only a knowledge of the passage on our Lord's part (which may or may not have been the case), but also a particular reading which is not instantly suggested by it. A tradition like the foregoing, on the other hand, would not only be likely to be known to Him, but would run in His mind constantly towards the end, and might well be

supposed to have played a part in the final settling of His purpose to lay down His life for the Kingdom. If, indeed, that were the case, we have all the conditions necessary to account for the Saviour's cry of disappointment in His last moment on the Cross. He had made His sacrifice in faith and hope of the Messianic Revealing "after three days." But His life was ebbing away, and Elijah had not yet appeared: his cry of "Peace cometh to the world," promised for the *first day*, had not yet been heard. Was he, after all, coming? If he did not appear now, would the *third day* appearance also prove to be illusory? Elijah had failed Him: *Ἠλεία, Ἠλεία, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί*; There was nothing left for Him to do—and here we can make a perfectly natural transition to the saying recorded by Luke—but to cast Himself utterly on His heavenly Father: *Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι το πνεῦμά μου.* Against this supposition it will, of course, be objected that Jesus had already said that Elijah had come in the person of John the Baptist (Mark ix. 12). But there is no real conflict between the two ideas. Even if Jesus *had* regarded John as preparing His way, it was only too obvious that nobody else had acclaimed him as the precursor of the Messiah. Besides, an appearance of Elijah in physical form—already past—did not preclude the possibility of a spiritual appearance at any future time. Had he not, in point of fact, just then appeared with Moses, on the Mount with Jesus? And part of the Rabbinic tradition referred to above is to the effect that Elijah would appear wherever a sudden divine interference was necessary. So that there is really nothing in Mark ix. 12 that tells against the view here being set forward.

4. It remains to consider the origin of the present text. And here it is to be noted, first of all, that neither the Cry of Dereliction nor the incident following is recorded by

St. Luke. The question, therefore, arises whether they were in the Marcan document used by Luke. And in this connection it is important to observe that the earlier "Elijah" passage in both Mark and Matthew at the descent of the Mount of Transfiguration, is also omitted by Luke, and it would seem that the two ought to be taken together. If Luke had these passages before him why did he not include them in his own story? On the other hand, is it likely that both passages would be added to Mark by a later hand? Stanton (*The Gospels as Hist. Doc.*, Part 11, p. 161) is of the opinion that the earlier passage was probably passed over by Luke intentionally as being a question of Rabbinic theology in which his readers would not be interested, while he "might have omitted the cry (from the Cross) from the idea that it might be misunderstood. . . . With the omission of the cry . . . the sequel was necessarily passed over, and it may not have seemed important" (p. 167). But if Stanton is right in thinking that Luke had both these incidents before him, is it not better to suppose that the same reason for their omission operated in both cases, namely, that they referred to a peculiarly Jewish matter in which his readers would not be concerned? But if that were so, can *'Ελωΐ, 'Ελωΐ,* etc., be put in that category? And, in any event, can we believe that Luke would deliberately omit the only exclamation of Jesus from the Cross in his source, especially if there was no real inconsistency between it and the saying he himself was recording? Clearly, the most natural way of explaining the omission of *'Ελωΐ, 'Ελωΐ,* etc., together with the incident following, is that in the Marcan document used by Luke, the passage was all of a piece and the cry was *addressed to Elijah*, as the bystanders themselves said. Further, it is not easy to see, from the present text of Mark, how the cry *could* have been misunderstood as a cry for Elijah. There is no great

similarity between *Ἐλωΐ* and *Ἠλείᾳ*, and it will be admitted that Matthew's Hebrew *Ἠλεὶ* (xxvii. 46) alone could account for the misunderstanding. But it is just at this point that we find a clue to the process of change in the text of Mark. Matthew, with his eye always on the Old Testament, would not be slow to see the similarity between the cry to Elijah and the opening words, in Hebrew, of Psalm xxii. He may, besides, have judged that Mark himself had made a mistake. At all events, the alteration could easily be made and the misunderstanding thrown on the bystanders. But the Marcan redactor, in copying Matthew's emendation, followed Mark's preference for Aramaic, leaving the remarks and the action of the bystanders not nearly so well accounted for as they are in Matthew.

F. J. Moore.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

IV

xi. 1. *Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.*

"Learn to speak frankly and simply of yourself as of others, when this is necessary, just as St. Paul often speaks of himself in the epistles. See with what dignity and simplicity he always speaks of himself, and is able to say even the loftiest things without displaying any emotion or self-consciousness. Of course, everyone cannot attain St. Paul's sublime simplicity, and it were dangerous indeed to affect it; but when there is any real call to speak about yourself in ordinary life, try to do so in all straightforwardness, neither yielding to mock modesty nor to the shamefacedness which belongs to false pride."

Fénelon.

"And Arthur's knighthood sang before the King:—
'The King will follow Christ, and we the King
In whom high God hath breathed a secret thing.'"
Tennyson, *The Coming of Arthur.*

xi. 2. *Now I praise you, brethren, that ye . . . keep the ordinances, as I delivered them unto you.*

"The moral side of an industry," says Conrad in *The Mirror of the Sea*, "is the attainment and preservation of the highest skill on the part of the craftsmen. It is made up of accumulated tradition, kept alive by individual pride . . . and, like the higher arts, it is spurred on and sustained by discriminating praise."

xi. 14. *Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him?*

Hawkesworth notes: "The fanatics in the time of Charles I, ignorantly applying the text, 'Ye know that it is a shame for men to have long hair,' cut theirs very short. It is said that the Queen, once seeing Pym, a celebrated patriot, thus cropped, inquired who that round-headed man was; and that from this incident the distinction became general, and the party were called Roundheads."

xi. 18. *I hear that there be divisions among you.*

"Dear Amy was at the Sunday School from half-past nine till church-time, doing a good bit of work, in her way, and smoothing the quarrels of the teachers. For strange though it is, it is equally true that the duty and practice of teaching the young idea how to shoot drive many good and benevolent people to long to shoot one another."
R. D. Blackmore, *Cradock Nowell* (ch. ix).

"Quarrels were always ready to break out," says Tolstoy in *Ivan Ilyitch* (ch. ii), describing a Russian household. "Only at rare intervals came those periods of affection which distinguish married life, but they were not of long duration. They were little islands in which they rested for a time; but then again they pushed out into the sea of secret animosity, which drove them further and further apart."

xi. 22. *Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God?*

"Out of those the Apostle's words, 'Have ye not houses to eat and drink?'—albeit temples such as now were not then erected for the exercise of the Christian religion, it hath been nevertheless not absurdly conceived that he teacheth what difference should be made between house and house . . . Christ could not suffer that the temple should serve for a place of mart, nor the Apostle of Christ that the church should be made an inn. When therefore we sanctify or hallow churches, that which we do is only to testify that we make them places of public resort, that we invest God with them, that we sever them from common uses."

Hooker, *Law of Ecclesiastical Polity* (bk. v. xii).

xi. 25. *This do, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.*

"He that findes a silver vein
Thinks on it, and thinks again:
Brings thy Saviour's death no gain?"

George Herbert.

xi. 28. *Let a man examine himself.*

"There is a constant tendency to lower our moral standard, unless we are obliged periodically to pull ourselves up and see whether we are really making for our goal."

Alice Gardner, *The Conflict of Duties* (p. 225).

"Keenly alive to manly honour and to the goodness of womankind, he found himself playing false to both, and he hated himself when he thought of it. But the worst of him was that he did not think habitually and stedfastly; he talked to himself and he thought of himself, but he very seldom examined himself."

R. D. Blackmore, *Alice Lorraine* (ch. xli).

xi. 29. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.*

"I have known several men," says Goethe in his autobiography, "who, although their manner of thought and life was perfectly rational, could not free themselves from thinking about the sin against the Holy Ghost and from fearing lest they had

committed it. A similar trouble threatened me on the subject of the Communion; for the text that anyone who partook of the Sacrament unworthily 'eateth and drinketh damnation to himself,' had at a very early age made a terrible impression on me. Every horror I had read of in mediæval history, about the judgments of God, about the strange ordeals by red-hot iron, flaming fire, swelling with water, and even what the Bible tells us of the draught which agreed with the innocent but puffed up and burst the guilty—all this presented itself to my imagination and formed most fearful combinations, since false vows, hypocrisy, perjury, blasphemy, all seemed to weigh down the unworthy person at this solemn act. It was all the more terrible, as no one could venture to pronounce himself worthy."

xii. 1. *I would not have you ignorant.*

Cardinal Newman, says Mr. R. H. Hutton, "may be said to have taught us that all minds, however deeply steeped in a world of false teaching, are given some chance of struggling and finding their way to something better, and that our spiritual life depends on our eagerly using that chance, and voluntarily submitting ourselves ever more and more to the higher influence that has touched our lives."

xii. 4. *There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.*

"Hector, thou art hard to be persuaded by them that would counsel thee; for that God has given thee excellence in the works of war, therefore in council also thou art fain to excel other men in knowledge. But in nowise wilt thou be able to take everything upon thyself. For to one man has God given for his portion the works of war, to another the dance, to another the cup and song, but in the heart of yet another hath far-seeing Zeus placed an excellent understanding, whereof many men get gain, yea he saveth many an one."

Homer's *Iliad* (bk. xiii), tr. Lang, Leaf, and Myers.

xii. 8–9. *For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom . . . to another faith by the same Spirit.*

"And now, methought, I began to look into the Bible with new eyes, and read as I never did before; and especially the Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul were sweet and pleasant to me. . . . And as I went on and read, I lighted on that passage,

'To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; and to another faith,' etc. And though, as I have since seen, that by this Scripture the Holy Spirit intends, in special, things extraordinary, yet on me it did then fasten with conviction that I did want things ordinary, even that understanding and wisdom that other Christians had. On this word I mused, and could not tell what to do, especially this word 'Faith' put me to it, for I could not keep it, but sometimes must question whether I had any faith or no. For I feared that it shut me out of all the blessings that other good people had given them of God."

John Bunyan, *Grace Abounding*, 46, 47.

xii. 12. *As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.*

"The initiative of ideas, the moral and intellectual initiative . . . the political initiative which leads to a social transformation, to the emancipation of an enslaved class, to the study of a new form of organisation—has never been appropriated by any single nation, by France less than by any other. Like the flaming torches, the *lampada vitæ*, which were passed from hand to hand, in the sacerdotal ceremonies of ancient Rome, this initiative has passed from one nation to another, consecrating each and all missionaries and prophets of humanity. Were they not all destined to become hereafter brethren, fellow-labourers, equals, each according to his special capabilities, in the great common workshop of Humanity, toward a common end."

Mazzini, *Europe and Its Condition.*

xii. 14. *The body is not one member but many.*

"In abandoning his exclusive individuality he becomes for the first time a real and living individual; and in accepting as his own the life of others he becomes aware of a life in himself that has no limit and no end . . . When the tongue, for example—which is a member of the body—regards itself as a purely separate existence for itself alone, it makes a mistake, it suffers an illusion, and descends into its pettiest life. What is the consequence? Thinking that it exists apart from the

other members, it selects food just such as shall gratify its most local self, and living and acting thus ere long it ruins that very sense of taste, poisons the system with improper food, and brings about disease and death. Yet if healthy, how does the tongue act? Why, it does not run counter to its own sense of taste, or stultify itself. It does not talk about sacrificing its inclinations for the good of the body and the other members; but it just acts as being one in interest with them and they with it. . . . Therefore the tongue may enter into a wider life than that represented by the mere local sense of taste, and experiences more pleasure often in the drinking of a glass of water which the whole body wants, than in the daintiest sweetmeat which is for itself alone. Exactly so, man in a healthy state does not act for himself alone, practically cannot do so. Nor does he talk cant about 'serving his neighbour,' etc., but he simply acts for them as well as for himself, because they are part and parcel of his life—bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and in doing so he enters into a wider life, finds a more perfect pleasure, and becomes more really a man than ever before."

Edward Carpenter, *Civilisation*, pp. 126–28.

"The brain can no more disown the general laws of the organism than the foot can. The loyal obedience of each member is at once its duty and its safety. St. Paul, with his usual force, fervour and sagacity, has grandly illustrated this text; and if you ever feel inclined fretfully to kick against your special function in the great social organism, I advise you to make a serious reading of 1 Corinthians xii. 14–31."

Professor Blackie, *Self-Culture* (p. 63).

In *Horæ Subsecivæ* Dr. John Brown, writing to Dr. Cairns, tells how his father "often said, with a dying energy lighting up his eye, and nerving his voice and gesture, that if it pleased God to let him again speak in his old place, he would not only proclaim again, and, he hoped, more simply and more fully, the everlasting gospel to lost man, but proclaim also the gospel of God to the body, the religious and Christian duty and privilege of living in obedience to the divine laws of health. He was delighted when I read to him, and turned to this purpose that wonderful passage of St. Paul, 'For the whole body is not

one member but many, etc.' The lesson from all this is, Attend to your bodies, study their structure, functions, and laws."

xii. 18. *God hath set the members every one of them in the body.*

"All are needed by each one;
Nothing is fair or good alone."

Emerson.

xii. 21. *The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.*

"The sense of the completeness of the individual life which we meet first in the writings of the Stoics, and which was absorbed and intensified by early Christianity, is not recognised as true by the mind of our day. In looking back on it through the development of subsequent ages we see it to be an illusion —the inevitable illusion of the first embrace with which men greet a new idea. Man is not free as the Stoic thought he was free. 'The hand cannot say to the head, I have no need of thee.' That is the warning of the first great man whom the world knew as a Christian, but it was hardly realised in the age which followed the preaching of Paul."

Julia Wedgwood, *The Moral Ideal*, pp. 338–39.

xii. 24, 25. *God hath tempered the body together . . . that there should be no schism in the body.*

"The progress of knowledge during the last seventy years," says Huxley, "enables us to see that neither Geoffroy nor Cuvier was altogether right nor altogether wrong; and that they were meant to hunt in couples instead of pulling against one another. Science has need of servants of very different qualifications."

xii. 25. *But that the members should have the same care one for another.*

"The curé rose . . . and said: 'Here, sit down in my place, and write what I tell you, while I stretch my legs. So; never mind whether you understand it or not. I am saying it for myself: it helps *me* to understand it better. Now, as I walk, you write . . . "It is not good for man to be alone, because" —because—let me see; where—ah, yes!—"because rightly self is the"—ah! no, no, my boy; not a capital S for "self" —ah! that's the very point—small *s*—"because rightly self is

the smallest part of us. And because in my poor small way I am made like Him, the whole world becomes part of me"—small *m*, yes, that is right!' From bending a moment over the writer, the priest straightened up and took a step backward . . . saying, 'My boy, God is a very practical God—no, you need not write it; just listen a moment. Yes, and so when he gave us natures like His, He gave men not wives only, but brethren and sisters and companions and strangers, in order that benevolence, yes and even self-sacrifice—mistakenly so called—might have no lack of direction and occupation; and then bound the whole human family together by putting everyone's happiness into some other one's hands. I see you do not understand: never mind; it will come to you little by little. It was long coming to me.'"

G. W. Cable, *Bonaventure* (ch. vi).

xii. 31. *Covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet show I unto you a more excellent way.*

"Here see, acquitted of all vain pretence,
The reign of genuine charity commence;
Though scorn repay her sympathetic tears,
She still is kind and still she perseveres;
Pure in her aim and in her temper mild,
Her wisdom seems the weakness of a child:
She makes excuses when she might condemn,
Reviled by those who hate her, prays for them;
Suspicion lurks not in her artless breast,
The worst suggested, she believes the best;
Not soon provoked, however stung and teased,
And, if perhaps made angry, soon appeased;
She rather waives, than will dispute, her right,
And injured makes forgiveness her delight.
Such was the portrait an apostle drew,
The bright original was one he knew;
Heaven held his hand, the likeness must be true."

Cowper.

"Moral ambition has no pride; it only desires to fill its place, and make its note duly heard in the universal concert of the God of love."

Amiel.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

" . . . I HAVE kept this newspaper cutting beside me for some months, and it is only with much hesitation that I ask you to read it and please say something about it. For I feel sure that you would not alter the beginning of our Bible without having some reason for it." (N. S., Birmingham).

The cutting you enclose from the *Daily Sketch* is not very polite, but, as it raises an important issue, I shall be glad to explain the point. The newspaper writer says that " the tragedy of all is the opening verse, which for us has always begun with breathless solemnity : ' In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void : and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' Dr. Moffatt is evidently under the impression that he is addressing a Sunday-school class, for he opens : ' This is the story of how the universe was formed. When God began to form the universe, the world was void and vacant, but the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.' "

It is enough to state two elementary facts. (i) The story of the creation in our version is made out of two separate stories. The first ends in the middle of ii. 4 with the words, " These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth." Here the term " generations " means the story of their origin, i.e. what has been described in i. 1–ii. 3. But this Hebrew phrase, " these are the generations," is always prospective, not a summary, elsewhere in the document from which the story is taken, and therefore the majority of scholars see that it stood originally before i. 1–ii. 3, and that the final compiler of the book shifted it to the end, when he was adding the second story (ii. 4b–25), in order to form a transition. What my version does is to restore the words to their original position—or at least to what may reasonably be supposed to have been their original position, upon this theory of the text. The second (ii) point is the translation of i. 1–2. The traditional English version is defensible, and it is

so short and dignified that it appears to be inevitable. But there are grammatical difficulties, and some mediæval Jewish scholars like Rashi and Ibn Ezra rendered it, " In the beginning of God's creating of the heaven and earth, etc." This may have been the old traditional Jewish interpretation, and many modern scholars prefer it. I agree with this view, especially in the form which makes verse 2 the apodosis ; it deserves, as Dr. Skinner admits, more consideration than it has received. The instinctive objection no doubt is that it makes the story open with a long sentence, which seems cumbrous. But this is not an insuperable objection. Indeed I notice that the view of the syntax which I have followed is now supported afresh by Mr. W. F. Albright, in *The Journal of Biblical Literature* (vol. xliii., 1924), who argues independently in favour of it. After discussing the two alternatives, " in the beginning of God's creation," and " in the beginning God created," he concludes that " ancient Oriental parallels, especially from Mesopotamia, show that the first possibility is more original. Nearly all Accadian cosmogonies began with the word *inûmi*, later *enûma*, literally ' in the day that,' but semantically meaning ' when '." Thus the longer view of the syntax turns out to be typically Sumerian, and this is a point in its favour. The meaning of the whole passage is beset with uncertainty, even on the score of syntax, and it is an extremely delicate task to reach any satisfactory decision. But from what I have said you will understand that the version I have printed is neither arbitrary nor unfaithful, and that the traditional version cannot claim to be the sole rendering of the original.

LOVE AND FEAR.

The paragraph in 1 John iv. 17–18 upon love and fear becomes intelligible when we realize that it refers to the future judgment. The day of judgment is to come, and all Christians must meet it. But, as the supreme test of character and conduct there will be love, the life which is now immersed in love need have no anxious fears about the final scrutiny.

Love is complete with us (τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, as in ii. 5 ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται) *when* (ἐν τούτῳ. . . ἵνα κτλ, as in John xv. 8) *we have absolute confidence about the day of judgment, since* (ὅτι, giving the reason for the confidence)

in this world (i.e. prior to the day of judgment) *we are living* (i.e. in the love-life of God) *as He lives* (καθὼς ἐκεῖνος, as in iii. 7, i.e. Jesus Christ). *Love has no dread in it ; no, love in its fulness* (ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη) *drives all dread away* (excludes this servile terror), *for dread has to do with punishment* (ὁ φόβος κόλασιν ἔχει)—*anyone who has dread has not reached the fulness of love* (the complete state of love).

In the Johannine vocabulary φόβος is invariably used in its lower or bad sense ; e.g. in John vii. 13, xix. 35, xx. 19, in the phrase διὰ φόβον Ἰουδαίων. The synoptic sense of "awe" or "reverence" never occurs. Here the proper equivalent therefore is a term like "dread." Similarly, κόλασις only occurs here and in the passage on the last judgment in Matthew xxv. 46, and denotes the punishment inflicted upon the callous and heartless. The main difference between the two descriptions is that while in Matthew xxv. the reference is to deeds of love done without a direct consciousness of Christ, here it is to deeds of love done because they are enjoined by the Lord. Otherwise the point is the same. What excludes men from God's presence is heartlessness ; this is the damning sin, the one thing of which we have to be afraid. But, the writer argues, a life which is consciously lived in mutual love need have no such misgivings. It is the callous heart, wrapped up in selfish indifference, which alone is punished at the last judgment. Consequently, as life here and now is dominated by love, it ought to have absolute confidence in anticipating the final scrutiny. The only thing which makes for legitimate self-accusation is the consciousness of defective brotherly love. Any misgivings therefore point to a failure in this love, which we may and must remedy at once. This is high and heroic doctrine, but the writer states it without qualification, insisting that it is only the unforgiving, self-absorbed spirit which need fear the last judgment. In other words, the loving heart may well have a good conscience and possess a quiet mind, in view of the end. If we analyse the argument, it amounts to this, that love enables us to believe in the reality of God's love, whereas the pitiless, unforgiving heart judges God by its own standards and dreads instinctively His treatment. Our dread of the last day, in short, is proportionate to our lack of brotherly love. A life which is being steadily lived in harmony with the purpose and will of Him who is to be

our Judge need have no nervous dread of His decisions. Such a life is indeed *in God* already, and being so rooted in the divine, eternal life, will never be torn from it.

Or, to put it otherwise, true love of others makes us forget ourselves ; a Christian who is absorbed in meeting the needs of others and in discharging the duties of love here, has no room or time for hesitation or doubt about his personal salvation at the end. He can leave that humbly and quietly to God. Fear or dread is self-centred. True love, busied with its duties to others, has no room for nervous fears about its own destiny. The last touch that such love puts to its work is to cast out any dread of being rejected or hurt by God.

The opposite of *παρρησία* is shame, i.e. the humiliation of being exposed as unworthy (so ii. 28 *ἵνα ἐὰν φανερωθῇ σχῶμεν παρρησίαν καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ*) at the final scrutiny, with lives out of keeping with His. This exposure involves exclusion from God. But how can such punishment await a life which has all along been inside the divine love, living by its standards and living for its ends ? No doubt the writer, as Dr. Gore says, " thinks in extremes." The alternatives to him are in love and out of love. We may reflect that some honest, unselfish souls feel they have much to reproach themselves with, even after a long, Christian career of service, and that they may hesitate to take this assurance to themselves. Nevertheless, the principle remains true. The problem of fear and love in the religious experience had already been discussed by Philo, and there are signs that it was being elsewhere discussed about the time when this epistle was composed. But the writer is not occupied with any such psychological analysis. He does not mean that fear punishes or chastises the Christian in a salutary sense. What is before his mind is rather that any dread of the last judgment points to a defect in true love here and now. " The more selfish we are, the harder is it for us to believe in the sacrifice of Christ ; and the more that with anger or sullen hate we brood over wrongs done to ourselves do we think that God, who has all power of vengeance, will use it on us who have wronged Him. On the other hand, if we would hurt no one, and cease to help the wretched only when they will not let themselves be helped ; if it be worse to us than any bodily pain to hear anyone wailing, we are sure that it must be so with God,

since 'He is greater than our hearts'—greater in pity and in love than we are. . . . Wilfulness and love of sin may set at nought His pity, but the heart that is perfect in love neither loves sin nor is wilful. God Himself has cast these evils out of it, and with them fear also is gone" (Dr. Charles Watson, *The First Epistle of John,* pp. 345, 346).

VARIA.

(i) Dr. Ranston's paper upon Orphism, in our August issue, raises a problem which has been debated keenly, viz., the possibility of such a cult having influenced primitive Christianity, and in particular the theology of St. Paul. An Italian scholar, V. Macchioro, has written a special monograph upon this, *Orfismo e Paolinismo,* in which he argues that the apostle must have been familiar with the current Orphic ritual and doctrine; he may not have been an initiate, but the setting of his ideas upon redemption is too like Orphism to be independent of it, especially the idea of a divine saviour dying and rising again and of the regeneration of the believer through a mystical reproduction of all this in his inner experience. Macchioro does not deny that Paul's religion arose out of a real experience of Jesus Christ by the great apostle, and he admits the wide gap between Orphism and Christianity, but he does not see how we can explain Paul's theological interpretation of that experience unless we suppose that he was using ideas and terms of Orphism to convey the new and higher truth, and when we recall the spread of Orphism in Asia Minor, where it blended with Judaism, it seems possible if not probable that this was the source from which Paul derived his views of the believer dying and rising to life through faith in Jesus Christ.

Macchioro's view is discussed by Professor F. Anderson in *The Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy* (ii. 3, pp. 197–209). He has been good enough to forward a reprint of his paper. It points out that Macchioro's interest—for he has a religious interest as well as a scientific curiosity—is to get back from Paul's sacramentalism to the simpler idealism of the religion taught by Jesus. Paul, says the Italian scholar, "was a marvellous mediator between Jesus, who preached the kingdom of God within us, and an age which was unable to

distinguish between means and end, and could only conceive religion sacramentally in forms of ritual action. Paul presented to humanity the new wine in the old vessels to which it was accustomed, vessels which Christ perhaps would have broken; and thanks to the vessels humanity drank." But nowadays, says Macchioro, we do not need these vessels. Professor Anderson thinks that Macchioro, whose scholarship is beyond question, has at last succeeded in adducing positive evidence for the influence of one mystery-religion upon Paul, both in this monograph and in earlier works like his *Orfismo e Cristianesimo* (1921). "Orphic fraternities were to be found almost everywhere in the lands surrounding the Eastern Mediterranean. These secret societies were open to all, and included women, foreigners, and slaves, and through their medium Orphism was propagated, with its superstitions, faiths, and hopes for another life, from family to family, city to city, nation to nation," particularly with its stress on the dualism of spirit and flesh, and its redemption of man by means of a mystical process in which initiation corresponded to Paul's baptism.

(ii) Lagrange, in his recent edition of Luke's gospel, renders ii. 2 *αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*) "ce recensement fut antérieur à celui qui eut lieu Quirinius étant gouverneur de Syrie," i.e., he revives the old interpretation of *πρώτη* as a comparative. Joseph Sickenberger, in the *Biblische Zeitschrift* (1924, pp. 215–16), defends this line of exegesis. He regards the phrase as brachylogical; after *ἐγένετο* understand *τῆς ἀπογραφῆς ἡ ἐγένετο*, followed by *ἡγεμονεύοντος κτλ.* What Luke meant to say, though he did not express himself as a classical author would have done, was that this was a census prior to that which was carried out under Quirinius.

(iii) In his treatise on *Die Geburt des Kindes*, last year, E. Norden reopened the problem of the fourth eclogue of Vergil, in order to show that this tradition about a divine child to be born at the beginning of the new æon in 40 B.C. goes back to Egyptian sources. The reign of Helios, restoring the golden age, was to begin on December 25, and the child was to be born on January 6, as the progenitor and forerunner of a better race of men. In the *American Journal of Philology* (1924, pp. 05–37) Professor W. A. Heidel writes an article on "Vergil's

Messianic Expectations," which deals with Norden's proofs. He demurs to the German scholar deducing, e.g., the sacred day of January 6 from the Egyptian mysteries, and concludes an exhaustive article by arguing "that Professor Norden's attempt to refer to Egypt the entire tradition of the Æon and the divine child expected at its inception fails for want of a general survey of the available data."

(iv) What does baptism for the dead mean, in 1 Corinthians xv. 29? A new theory is proposed by Herbert Preisker in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1924, pp. 298–304). He connects the practice with the intense eschatological passion of the primitive Church. The long-desired end would not come till the number of the elect was completed. The cry "Come, Lord Jesus" was a prayer which was only to be answered when the full tale of the pious had been made up, i.e. of those who by baptism had been made members of the chosen Church. But the gift of the Spirit which marked election was not invariably associated with baptism; sometimes it preceded baptism (Acts ix. 17, x. 44 f.), and Preisker thinks there must have been Christians in those primitive days who actually died without having been baptized. Now something had to be done for these; their death seemed to hinder the number of the elect being completed. So their relatives or friends get "baptized" vicariously for them, thereby ensuring that such Christians, even beyond death, would now be included in the heavenly list of the elect. Presently baptism became normal, and thus this primitive custom was no longer needful.

REVIEWS.

Ricerche Religiose, dirette da Ernesto Buonaiuti. Roma, Via G. Alberoni 7. January 1925.

We welcome the first number of a new bi-monthly magazine, whose purpose is "to encourage the study of religion both on the historical and philosophical sides by means of original essays and periodical summaries of the general movement of mind within the range of these disciplines." Its claim is to be inspired wholly by the principles of scientific investigation, and in this

number a good beginning has been made both in the point of thoroughness and of impartiality. It is a phenomenon significant and full of promise that in Italy to-day such a magazine should appear and should be able to count upon an audience.

A competent review of recent work on the Old Testament—Italian, French, German, English—is prefaced by the note that in Italy the revived interest in such studies has peculiarly taken the direction of translations of the biblical books, of which three are here described—Protestant, Roman, and Jewish. Professor Luzzi of Florence is supplementing his admirable New Testament by a rendering of the Old Testament, and has now issued the Pentateuch, Psalms, Job and Proverbs. The reviewer commends the translation as "generally excellent and always clear"; his only criticism concerns the notes which he would have wished to be fuller, but Luzzi in this must be allowed to control his own plans. Another rendering of the Pentateuch, coming from an orthodox Roman quarter, is objected to as exhibiting "a certain effeminacy, which not only fails to communicate the exquisite perfume of the original but actually wearies. If translation has to be, let it be really translation," to which many readers will say Amen.

The Editor contributes an ingenious discussion of the relations of Paul and Apollos, basing his argument on what he calls "the discreet and evasive allusions of Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians." He endeavours to make out conditions of exasperation which grew worse between the two schools, and insists that in particular "he that did the wrong" (2 Cor. vii. 12) is Apollos, whilst "he that suffered the wrong" is Paul himself. With an excess of ingenuity he discovers in Paul's quotation from Isaiah (1 Cor. i. 19)—"I will destroy (*apolo*) the wisdom of the wise"—a deliberate pun upon Apollos's name. Frankly I find no reason in the Epistles for asserting any such sharpness of antagonism. It is likely enough that Paul felt that Apollos depended unduly on oratorical and dialectic arts, and that, like many preachers since, he lacked the gift of making the first revolutionary impressions on human souls; but he recognized him as clearly a fellow-worker, with a substantial function of his own (1 Cor. iii. 6). And if relations had been such as the essayist requires, Paul would scarcely have *urged* Apollos to go (1 Cor. xvi. 12) where so much mischief was to be done.

An interesting philosophical article appears on "the problem of salvation," in which the writer starts with the assertion that "in the apologetic of action the decisive point where philosophy joins on to theology is not, as in the traditional apologetic, the idea of God, but the idea of divine revelation to men and their salvation by means of participation in divine grace. The crown of speculative investigation is not a theodicy, but, if the word is allowable, a *soteriodicy*." A learned discussion is given of the doctrine of the Church held by the Donatists. The writer notes in modern historians a tendency to treat Donatism as pre-eminently a politico-social movement, and he seeks to correct the balance on the purely doctrinal side.

W. M. Macgregor.

* * * * *

Le Fils de l'Homme: Essai Historique et Critique. Par Georges Dupont. Paris. 1924. Pp. 163.

The literature which has arisen from the vigorous discussion of the "Son of Man" problem in the New Testament, particularly during the last thirty years, is so extensive that a real need has arisen for a comprehensive critical survey of the findings of research on the several sides of the inquiry. In the present work the main lines of the investigation are carefully explored. If one does not feel that originality of thought and freshness of presentation are specially prominent qualities of the book, yet of the learning and care which have gone to its making there can be no question. Ample acquaintance with the literature of the problem is everywhere apparent, and the discussion is carried through with the clarity and precision of the French mind.

It is hardly a matter for surprise, in a work of this type, to find the author covering a great deal of familiar ground. In the earlier pages he discusses the affinities of the title, and of the ideas which may underlie it, with Jewish thought. The figure in Daniel vii. 13 is a "symbole du peuple d'Israël." On the disputed question as to whether in the "Similitudes" of Enoch the expression "the Son of Man" was used as a messianic title, M. Dupont argues, not convincingly, for the negative position. In the extant Ethiopic text of the "Similitudes" three different renderings of "Son of Man" are found, and usually, though not invariably, there is an accompanying

demonstrative pronoun. This, the author thinks, points fairly clearly in the direction of the view which he is disposed to adopt. He concludes that "le terme de 'Fils de l'Homme' n'a jamais été employé comme titre messianique avant l'ère chrétienne" (p. 22). The linguistic problem raised by the Greek form of the title as it appears in the Gospels altered the basis of the discussion and introduced its liveliest modern phase. M. Dupont states in a convenient form the main results of the inquiry regarding the Aramaic basis of the Greek title, and concludes that "dans la langue parlée autour de Jésus et par Jésus lui-même, *bar-enasch* (comme *enasch*) signifiait l'homme en général, l'humanité, un être humain déterminé ou non, parfois tout simplement quelqu'un" (p. 39). In the following passages in the Synoptic Gospels the messianic title disappears when the underlying Aramaic term is correctly translated: Mark ii. 10 (= Matt. ix. 6, Luke v. 24); Mark ii. 28 (= Matt. xii. 8, Luke vi. 5); Matthew xii. 32 (= Luke xii. 10, cf. Mark iii. 28); Matthew viii. 20 (= Luke vii. 58); Matthew xi. 19 (= Luke vii. 34). The author would also eliminate "une série de passages où 'Fils de l'Homme' désigne nettement le Christ et joue le rôle d'un simple pronom personnel" (p. 60). Those who approve of this method of handling the problem will recognize that the various predications of the title in the Synoptics cannot be embraced within some comprehensive formula with much hope of a fruitful result. But M. Dupont does not hesitate to advance the radical thesis that Jesus never employed the Aramaic expression as a messianic title, whether as a self-designation, or of a figure other than Himself who would shortly appear. The title which is now found so often on the lips of Jesus was introduced "dans le texte par une tradition postérieure" (p. 159). "Le mot est né dans le texte des Évangiles, sinon d'une erreur de traduction au moins d'une interprétation imparfaite. Le mot araméen *bar-nascha* (homme) a été traduit littéralement par *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, une énigme sur le territoire grec. Les chrétiens hellénistes ne le comprirent pas et y vivent un nom du Messie, analogue à tant d'autres créés par l'imagination juive. Alors—mais alors seulement, c'est-à-dire au sein de l'Église chrétienne—le titre fut combiné avec l'image daniélique du Fils de l'Homme et identifié avec le Messie crucifié dont on attendait le prochain retour dans

la gloire céleste. Le terme n'a donc pas été emprunté à l'apocalypse juive. . . . C'est par ces théories eschatologiques que la foi des premiers chrétiens essaya d'établir que le Christ, quoique vaincu et supplicié, ou plutôt par son supplice infamant même, était bien le Messie attendu " (pp. 159–60).

The problem to which M. Dupont has addressed himself is of great importance for the study of the person and career of Jesus. No one can read this competent piece of work without forming a good impression of the limits within which the long inquiry has confined the doubtful major issues. It is clear that theories which are formulated on the basis of the present plentiful distribution and various predications of the title in the Synoptics are, in effect, invitations to ignore the main course of criticism in this regard. On the other hand, the case for the view that Jesus did not use *bar-nascha* as a messianic title, whether of Himself or of another figure, is scarcely lifted beyond the plane of hypothesis, and provokes criticism from several angles. If Hellenistic Christians (to consider only one of the arguments on which M. Dupont relies) were the first to regard *bar-nascha* as a messianic title of Jesus, how is it that they produced so odd and unidiomatic a rendering of it as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*? Does not the strange form of the Greek title suggest that *bar-nascha* was already in use as a title of Jesus amongst Aramaic-speaking Christians? However, the pages which the author devotes to his theory—which is not peculiar to him in its main features—are instructive, if only in forcing afresh on one's notice the difficulties which beset this proposed solution.

It should be said that the New Testament portion of the discussion is not altogether confined to the Gospels.

W. H. Cadman.

* * * * *

The Gospel and the Modern Mind. By W. R. Matthews, D.D., Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, King's College, London. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1925. Pp. ix., 188. $1.75. London: Macmillans. 7*s.* 6*d.*

In the summer of 1924 Professor Matthews visited America and preached a course of sermons, having this same general title, in St. Bartholomew's Church, New York. He has now recast these sermons in such a way that the whole becomes

an "essay in popular theology" addressed to educated men and women of our day who have difficulty in finding a place for Christianity within the framework of a modern outlook.

We may say at once that the essay here made is an unusually successful one. It would, indeed, be difficult to mention more than two or three other books, on anything like the same scale, in which the essential meaning of religion and the particular message of Christianity are expressed in a way which is at the same time so adequate to the great contents involved and so likely to be acceptable to contemporary opinion. In his Boyle lectures on *Christian Philosophy* Professor Matthews has already shown his skill in the discussion of technical theological issues; but he knows that Christianity is after all a gospel for the plain man and that wherever it is stated in such a way as to be unintelligible to the plain man, or as to be incapable of immediate application to the plain man's needs, it is being stated wrongly. In these pages it is stated with a rarely attractive simplicity and directness, yet without any loss of its rich substantiality. What was the essential message of Jesus? Why do we believe in God? How are we to think of God? What do Trinity and Incarnation and Regeneration mean? What is the Christian rule of life? These are the questions which this little book discusses. It is, of course, a book for the hour and pretends to be no more; but it is a book which at least one reviewer is often likely, while the present hour lasts, to put in the hands of young inquirers.

What Dr. Matthews has written is not such as to challenge detailed criticism, and perhaps it is ungrateful to single out scattered points of disagreement in a line of thought which carries so much of our assent. But a few "snags" are worth noticing. Of the nine chapters the least profitable will almost certainly be found to be that entitled "The Trinity in Human Experience"; for here it is very difficult indeed to escape the impression—an impression too commonly received from discussions of this topic—that the writer is trying to force into the ancient formula a modern meaning which could be far more lucidly and satisfactorily expressed if he left the ancient formula entirely alone. Nor is Dr. Matthews' exposition in any wise a clear one at this point. His attempt is to make the three persons of the Trinity correspond to three "moments"

in our religious experience; but at the end of a second careful reading of the chapter one still finds oneself in doubt as to what the three moments are. Elsewhere in the volume much emphasis is placed upon the fact that Christianity does not teach that God is a person, but only that He is personal. This is of course the distinction with which Professor Clement Webb has familiarized us between the personality *of* God and personality *in* God. But we venture to think that Dr. Matthews' way of stating it could lead to nothing but befogment in the kind of audience he is desirous of reaching. Here is some of what he says:

"When we say 'God is personal,' we do not necessarily mean that 'God is a person.' Though some Christian thinkers would accept both of these statements, the second is not necessary for Christian faith. . . . The essential belief of the Christian religion is not that God is a person but that He is personal."

Turning to certain individual pages, one might single out also a passage like the following:

"Many Christian thinkers . . . have said, 'We know nothing of God except through Jesus.' I confess I cannot understand this. . . . It would be nearer the truth to say that we can know nothing of Jesus except through God."

The reader will perhaps wonder whether that is not *even farther* from the truth, which is after all a much simpler thing than either of these dark sayings would make it seem. Or again:

"In the lower forms of religion we can distinguish two modes of supposed supernatural communication. We have the kind of prediction of the future which is derived from the observation of omens and the examination of the entrails of a sacrificed victim. This kind of pretended revelation is not religious at all in the strict sense of the term but belongs rather to the sphere of magic, since it does not necessarily involve any belief in gods and spirits. The religious type of revelation . . . depends rather upon persons who are supposed to be inspired."

Surely Dr. Matthews is wrong here. Surely all divination is, as such, religious—as distinctly religious a practice, indeed, as any that could be mentioned. The distinction here made by Dr. Matthews was made long ago by Cicero in his *De Divinatione* (following, no doubt, the lost treatise of Posidonius of Rhodes);

and Cicero clearly realizes that what he calls "artificial" divination is just as much concerned with *divinity* as is what he calls "natural" revelation. Divination of whatever kind *does* necessarily involve belief in gods, for its purpose is nothing else than to determine the will of the gods.

And is Dr. Matthews wise, on the one hand, in following Mr. Paul Elmer More in his recent insistence that "Greek philosophy is dualistic through and through"? Or, on the other hand, in making so much of the generalization that "it is only in the modern period that we have come to draw a clear distinction between mind and all other objects"? Is it not precisely from the Socratic tradition that the distinction between mind and *body* has come to us? One or two other queries we have made in Dr. Matthews' margins: but none are such as to lessen the warm gratitude which we feel for his book as a whole.

JOHN BAILLIE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

EIGHTEEN editions within twenty-five years—that is a record which speaks for itself. A book which has attained such a vogue is a wine that requires no bush. The metaphor is not very suitable in the case of an American book, but what the metaphor conveys is applicable to Professor I. M. Price's *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press). This, the latest edition, has been brought up-to-date by the author, and in its new form it is a convenient, clear handbook to the subject, admirably illustrated and well printed. There may be some readers who are still unacquainted with this textbook. For their benefit it is enough to say that they cannot find a better popular guide to the subject. Professor Price has had long experience as a teacher, and his Oriental scholarship has enabled him to write a first-rate manual.

* * * * *

"Our conception of conduct has become that of *safe*-conduct —a thing abhorrent to the heroic mind." This is a characteristic sentence from Dr. L. P. Jacks' Hibbert Lectures on *The Challenge*

of Life (Hodder and Stoughton : 2*s.* 6*d.*), three addresses which are alive with moral drive and urge. Dr. Jacks sets himself to give a modern interpretation of the heroic principle, as against its current opponents in religion and social reform. To take risks, to be capable of self-renunciation, and to give up a search for the least line of resistance, this, we are reminded, is the supreme morality for societies ; that is, they must learn to practise the morality of the hero. In the closing address he courageously applies the principle to labour, in quite a Carlylean vein. " The good workman must take up his cross—to no saint or martyr is it more ineluctably assigned than to him. But who in these days of happiness-hunting can persuade us to do *that* ? " Well, Dr. Jacks tries to persuade his readers, and anyone who knows how effectively he writes will understand that the pages of this small book are aglow with stimulus to thought and action.

* * * * *

The educational function of broadcasting is exhibited in the ten addresses which Professor R. S. Rait has printed under the title of *Critical Moments in British History* (Hodder and Stoughton : 3*s.* 6*d.*). Nearly all the subjects chosen lie between Henry VII and George II. Professor Rait writes lucidly and dispassionately ; he throws a cool ray of light upon the various episodes which he selects for treatment. Thus, in speaking of the dark days for Scotland when Charles II was persecuting the Covenanters, he observes that " Restoration Scotland was governed by a small body of councillors, of whom scarcely any had claims to statesmanship and few could be credited with sobriety or even with common decency . . . The Presbyterian party put themselves in the wrong by demanding that a covenanted king should comply with the terms of the oath which had been extorted from him, and carry out the preposterous policy of the solemn league and covenant by forcing Presbytery upon England. The Government, in turn, put itself in the wrong by proscribing Presbytery in Scotland. If the Presbyterians had the will to persecute, the Government had both the will and the power."

* * * * *

The Rev. T. A. Bold, M.A., has published a small book on the *New Testament Evidence for the Resurrection* (A. H. Stock-

well), in the main based on a critical study of the synoptic gospels. Mr. Bold's spirit is much to be praised. He is open-minded and fair, in handling his material and in arguing with those who are opposed to his views. He believes that the literal, physical resurrection of Jesus formed part of the earliest Christian tradition, and that it creates more difficulties to abandon this faith than to accept it. The conclusion of his careful examination of the evidence is that there are "very satisfactory reasons for believing in the physical resurrection of Jesus."

* * * * *

To re-tell Bible stories effectively is the aim of Mr. Asher Davidson in *The Hebrew Quest for God* (London: Teachers and Taught, 4 Fetter Lane. Price 1*s.* 6*d.*). He has gathered and used much Oriental detail, and shows himself possessed of real imaginative power. The small book should be a help to those who have to tell these stories to young or popular audiences.

* * * * *

The author of *The Burden of the Pharisees* (A. H. Stockwell: 7*s.* 6*d.*), Mr. J. W. Little, is a Scottish Presbyterian who, for all his appreciation of Baptist evangelicalism, is convinced that "the present-day Baptist mode of dipping, or momentary immersion, is unscriptural (the early Baptists both in England and on the Continent employed the mode of sprinkling)," or, as he adds, "a practice observed, if not actually initiated, by the Pharisees of old." He examines the apostolic practice and the New Testament evidence, and is convinced that the primitive method was sprinkling. The subject has been hotly debated, and our author, it must be confessed, does not contribute very much that is new to the solution of the problem. But he has read his Bible and some of the early patristic literature; also, he is convinced of the accuracy of his views.

* * * * *

The third volume of *The Local Colour of the Bible* (T. and T. Clark: 8*s.*), edited by C. W. Budden, M.D., and the Rev. E. Hastings, M.A., covers the New Testament writings. Naturally the gospels and the book of Acts lend themselves more effectively than the epistles to the method followed by the compilers. The various sections contain information about topical habits of life which are connected with the text; the material

is plainly arranged, and a good index enables the reader to avail himself of what is contained in this useful volume. The book is intended for those who have not access to learned volumes. It is both popular and bright.

* * * * *

A series of papers on *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons: 7*s.* 6*d.*), edited by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., has been published. The papers are introduced by a picture of Thomas, and a fourfold appendix is added. One of the most interesting is that by Mr. Edward Bullough upon "Dante, the poet of St. Thomas," which shows wide reading and acute perception. The other papers are mainly of interest to Roman Catholic readers; they are semi-popular and marked by a determined ardour of admiration.

* * * * *

Tabernacle Types and Teaching (Stanley Martin and Co.: 10*s.* 6*d.*) is a collection of studies in the typology of the Pentateuch, written by Bible students who believe that the furniture of the Hebrew tabernacle was mysteriously designed as an adumbration of Christian truth, "furniture" including such things as dress, ritual and architecture. Some coloured illustrations are added, in order to make the argument more convincing. A fair specimen of the argument may be selected from p. 20, where the writers draw out the mystical meaning of the "shittim" wood used for the tabernacle. It was "the only available timber in the desert, where it is still found in the very driest situations," and thus it typifies Christ, for "Moses and the people were shut up to this one tree. Even so men have not a choice of Saviours, but are shut up to Jesus only." Similarly was not Christ described by the prophet as growing up like a root out of a dry ground? Finally, as this wood was always covered with gold in the tabernacle, so we are intended to learn that Christ's humanity and deity are conjoined.

* * * * *

In *Boys!* (Hodder and Stoughton: 5*s.*) Mr. D. L. Finnemore has edited what he claims to be "a complete manual for workers among boys." It is really a programme of the Boys Life Brigade, an organization which, like its larger and older companions, the Boys' Brigade and Boy Scouts, is endeavouring to reach boys of to-day through an organization which appeals to

their instincts and interests. But anyone who has to work among boys will learn much from these pages whether he prefers the Boys Life Brigade or not. The chapters are practical and lucid. There are some useful illustrations, and the book is written in a spirit of infectious enthusiasm, which is quite alive to realities.

* * * * *

The sixteenth century of the Council of Nicæa has led Dr. A. E. Burn, at the suggestion of the English Church Union, to write a short estimate and account of that famous gathering. *The Council of Nicæa* (S.P.C.K.: 3*s.* 6*d.*) is a good example of scholarly popularization. Dean Burn writes easily, out of a full knowledge of his subject, and although the story has been often told, it bears re-telling. Naturally, the book pays special attention to the importance of the Nicene Creed, for, as the writer had already remarked, "the faith of the Nicene Council is related to our Nicene Creed as a bud from a garden rose to the wild rose stock into which it is grafted." As a historian, Dean Burn cannot rhapsodize over the Council itself; it was disfigured by intrigues, unworthy of its aim. "We cannot look at it through rose-coloured spectacles and call it without qualification a Holy Synod." Yet its historical importance was great, and it is in the light of what its decisions meant for Christianity that we moderns look back upon it and try to appreciate its significance.

* * * * *

Lady Frances Balfour's biography of *Lord Balfour of Burleigh* (Hodder and Stoughton: 12*s.* 6*d.*), or, as she modestly chooses to call it, a Memoir, draws a vivid, attractive picture of one who served his country and his church manfully. Lord Balfour was one of the downright, honest, unsparing public men, who hold political office as a trust. His career as a statesman was honourable and laborious. But he was specially known and admired in Scotland as a churchman, intensely loyal to the Church of Scotland. Scotland has rarely had a better Secretary of State. Certainly it has not had, during the past half-century, any nobleman who identified himself so thoroughly with the national church, and this feature of his career is amply expounded by his biographer. Lord Balfour was not a man of speculative interests; neither had he any great gifts of persuasion. But he was an acknowledged leader in the councils of the Church, and for years

was the most representative layman north of the Border. Latterly he threw himself into the movement for the union of the two great Scottish churches. All this and more may be found chronicled in Lady Frances Balfour's well-written, sympathetic memoir, of which the opening chapter serves to enable English readers to understand how and why Lord Balfour was what he was, a true nobleman, a true Scot, and a zealous Presbyterian.

* * * * *

Mr. W. L. Wardle's Hartley Lecture on *Israel and Babylon* (Holborn Publishing House: 5*s*.) is a comprehensive popular account of the subject. He does not "wish to pose as an expert Assyriologist," but he has read widely in the literature of this vexed topic, and even devotes a closing chapter to the vagaries of the Pan-Babylonian hypothesis. For most people, who are unfamiliar with the problem, the relations between the Babylonian and Hebrew religions require to be stated not only fully but in almost elementary fashion, and Professor Wardle has done an educative piece of work in this department. His pages are careful and clear. They will reassure some readers and open the eyes of others. His general conclusion is that, while both Babylon and Israel go back to a common Semitic inheritance, and while Israel is occasionally indebted to Babylon, the details of this indebtedness "affect rather the outward form than the spiritual content of the traditions."

* * * * *

Mr. W. J. Farley has published a popular, effective book on *The Progress of Prophecy* (London: R.T.S., 6*s*.). It is intended to provide a plain account of Hebrew prophecy in its development. The arrangement is chronological; the successive prophets are brightly described, and altogether the result is a pleasant introduction to the subject. Mr. Farley has chosen to bring out the positive meaning of the prophecies rather than to spend space and time upon critical questions, although he has not ignored the latter. We welcome this eager, unpretentious handbook. It is written from the conviction that "the social and political situation of the Hebrew race on many occasions was so like present-day conditions, the circumstances surrounding the life of the Hebrew prophet and the Christian teacher so often correspond closely, that under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ

we may with great benefit take the ancient message as indeed a word of God for our own day."

* * * * *

The adjective "indispensable" is not to be lightly applied to books, but no one who has to work in any serious fashion will hesitate to apply it to the *Subject Index to Periodicals*, issued by the Library Association (London). The section upon "Theology and Philosophy (including Folk-Lore)" is now published, for 1922. It costs six shillings, and is well worth the money, for it supplies instant and reliable guidance to magazine articles of that year.

* * * * *

Mr. Arthur H. Stockwell has published two small books of religious verse, *The Holy Mount*, by William Robinson, and *The Hand of God*, by Helena S. Harper. The former contains eleven devout pieces, one of them on "Cuthbert and the Angel." Scottish readers will miss "Saint" before "Cuthbert," but otherwise the lines are apt. Miss Harper's verses are shorter and less ambitious, some of them evidently written in an Irish environment. Mr. Stockwell also publishes *The Great Task*, a set of verses written by H. E. Payne upon the tender subject of corporal punishment in schools, which is not a common theme. The master is supposed to speak:

"Dear little lad, if you but knew
How my heart craves your loyalty,
Yearns for the love that surges through
The flood-gates parting you and me,

"Longs for your growing mind to see
How all the stripes that I must give
Fall but to bid you rise and be
A man of worth. Why must there live

"For ever this enduring feud
Betwixt the teacher and the taught?"

And so on. To the moral of the lines no exception can be taken.

* * * * *

In *The Unwritten Gospel* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 8*s*. 6*d*.) Mr. Roderic Dunkerley has collected and discussed nearly two hundred and fifty sayings or stories of Jesus, which are

scattered in sources outside the gospels. This extra-canonical matter has never been so fully gathered. Whatever be the verdict passed upon the various excerpts, even although few scholars will be disposed to view them as favourably as Mr. Dunkerley does, yet he is entitled to gratitude for the work he has done. He neatly points out that even if such words are not accepted as genuine, they may be significant. "It has been said that a man's character can be known from the kind of stories told about him even though the incidents never actually happened." The book is written so that readers unfamiliar with any language but English may understand it. This is all to the good. It rests upon a wide range of research, and the arrangement is according to the various periods in the life of Jesus to which the sayings may be assigned. It was a happy idea to compile such a book. There is no work exactly like it in English, and we congratulate Mr. Dunkerley upon the success with which he has carried out his project.

* * * * *

The late Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, had just finished *The Book of Samuel* (National Adult School Union: 1*s.* 3*d.*), when he died. Dr. Skinner's contribution to the series of colloquial translations is marked by his customary thoroughness and independence. The conventional division into two books is disregarded, the deplorable state of the text is frankly recognized, and the translator boldly aims "to present the sense of the Hebrew in such language as would naturally be used by an English writer of the present day." The opening lines of the so-called Song of Hannah appear thus:

> "Exulteth my heart in Yahweh,
> Elate is my horn through my God;
> Wide open my mouth 'gainst my foes;
> For thy help makes me glad."

The helpfulness of the translation is increased by some footnotes. Thus 2 Samuel xvii. 25 is rendered: "This Amasa was the illegitimate son of an Ishmaelite named Jithra; his mother being Abigail, the daughter of Jesse, the sister of Zeruiah, Joab's mother." Dr. Skinner follows a LXX reading in preferring "Ishmaelite" to "Jezreelite," and on "illegitimate" he observes in a note: "Not in our sense, however. He was probably the

issue of an irregular marriage, in which the usual purchase-price had not been paid to the father of the bride."

* * * * *

The anti-religious legislation of the Soviet rulers in Russia is inspired by the dominant Communist minority, but it is important to know the precise terms of the legislation. These are arranged lucidly by P. Guidoulianiov in *La Législation Soviétique contre la Religion* (Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma, 1925). It is curious but not surprising that some of the older semi-communistic sects enjoy a measure of protection, but the organized church is severely treated, though, it is observed, " quelques membres des Soviets regrettent, comme impolitiques, ces violences anti-religieuses." The advantage of this monograph is that it furnishes a fairly complete and authentic version of the chief provisions enacted down to 1923. In the actual working out of the policy there are excesses which naturally do not fall within the scope of this pamphlet, but its pages contain enough to prove the legal powers at the disposal of communists who desire to eliminate Christianity from the country. The translation of Guidoulianiov's *précis* has been made as literal as possible, and an index enables the student to use its contents without trouble.

* * * * *

Mr. Arthur Simmonds has already done good service in exposing the vagaries of British Israelitism, one of the distressing religious creeds which thrive on a semi-educated soil. He has returned to this good work in *The British-Israel Theory Criticized* (S.P.C.K.: 6*d.*), a vigorous, effective pamphlet, which deals very patiently with the main tenets of the craze. No one who has not met British Israelites can have any notion of their weird exegesis, and Mr. Simmonds has wisely shown up this. " The pathetic thing is," as one Anglican bishop observes, " that they combine extraordinary ignorance with devout faith, and knowledge of the Bible with an utterly uncritical and unhistorical fanaticism in the use of it." Mr. Simmonds points out a better way. His pamphlet is brief, courteous, and trenchant.

CURRENT ISSUES.

When a classical scholar, who is more than a scholar, interprets ancient life, the result is generally a good book. It breathes wisdom as well as knowledge, and that is the mark of vitality in literature. Such a book is *The Greek Point of View.* It is written by an Oxford scholar, who is now Principal of University College, Toronto. Mr. Maurice Hutton has ideas of his own; he touches a wide range of topics; and among them the virtue of humility.

* * * * *

Or, is it a virtue? It was not, for a man like Nietzsche, who denounced it as a Christian aberration. But then Nietzsche glorified the qualities he lacked. This thinker, as Mr. Hutton says, "who was himself a shy and timid and deaf recluse, never shedding a drop of blood except when he shaved," canonized the opposite virtues of the assertive, pugnacious man, and misread the ethical problem. Humility is a virtue. But, Mr. Hutton admits, it was unknown to the Greeks.

* * * * *

They had indeed a quality which went by the untranslatable name of *σωφροσύνη* or *εὐβουλία*, but it was purely intellectual. It meant a proper perception of one's place in the great universe. It implied that a poor mortal like man should be too sensible to boast or swagger, "that such a creature should never boast, or should at least 'touch wood' after boasting, and throw salt over his shoulder, and perform religiously other antics, to propitiate the evil eye of the mighty unseen and jealous makers of the alien law." Such was Greek humility.

* * * * *

This is not to be taken without certain qualifications. Later on, Mr. Hutton himself allows that Socrates was both humble and conscious of authority. But on the whole, the verdict is true. What the Greeks considered humility was "a form of

intelligence, a confession of facts, of the actual nothingness of man before Nature."

* * * * *

And Christian humility? Mr. Hutton at once describes it as beyond the horizon of his Greeks. He takes St. Paul as a representative. The apostle was humble, but not as a Greek was. "He tells us at first whilst he is still a novice in the faith of Christ, that he is the least of all the Apostles and not worthy of being called an Apostle." This, by the way, is an exaggeration. When the Apostle wrote First Corinthians, he was far from being a novice in the faith. However, let that pass. Mr. Hutton proceeds: "At a later date, when his knowledge of Christ has progressed, that he is the least of all 'saints' or Church members; and last of all, when he is finishing his good fight and keeping the faith, that he is the chief of sinners."

* * * * *

What does this mean? That humility for a Christian like St. Paul was on a new basis. "Clearly it was his moral aspiration and his purified will that prompted this rising scale of self-abasement, and not a nice perception of his own claims as measured by the claims of his neighbours."

* * * * *

"Some say, Jeremiah," the disciples answered, when Jesus asked them what people thought He was. Perhaps they spoke better than they knew, says Mr. A. D. Martin in the July number of the *Congregational Quarterly*. He is dealing with the objections taken to the doctrine of everlasting punishment, a doctrine which in many quarters is regarded as a blot on Christianity. Yet apparently it was held by Jesus. Mr. Martin suggests that our Lord perhaps uttered and held it in the context of Jeremiah.

* * * * *

The belief that God could change His mind and relent, was firmly held by a prophet like Jeremiah. His famous parable of the potter is an illustration. "If a nation turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them," says the Lord through the prophet. That is, even an unequivocal sentence of doom may be reversed by God. Jeremiah asserts the divine sovereignty, and yet he qualifies or supplements it. As Dr. Skinner puts it, "God wills the perfection of His creatures; and though there is that in human nature which

resists and retards the accomplishment of His purpose, and may seem to frustrate a long course of patient discipline, the Almighty Worker does not forsake the work of His hands, but labours persistently, unceasingly, and in the end effectually, for the reconciliation of all things to Himself." Such is Jeremiah's faith. Or, as Sir George Adam Smith puts it, "the Divine Sovereignty is a real Sovereignty and therefore includes Freedom. It is not fettered by its own previous decrees. . . . There is a Divine as well as a human Freewill."

* * * * *

Now, Mr. Martin asks, as all the best elements of Jeremiah's mind reappear in Jesus, "may we not include therein his principle of the Divine Repentance? Is not that the accompanying assumption and true context of all our Lord's language of doom?" That is, did not Jesus assume that the threats and warnings of eternal doom were contingent?

* * * * *

There are two objections that will at once occur to the reader. One is, that Jeremiah's doctrine of the relativity or contingency of punishment refers only to the dealings of God with men and nations in this life. The other is, that the same principle would need to cover the promises of bliss to the righteous and obedient. Are they contingent too?

* * * * *

Mr. Martin frankly faces both difficulties; he does not consider them fatal to his theory. But they haunt the mind, even when it is prepared to see more in Mr. Martin's theory than a fanciful speculation. Probably many will not feel even the need of such relief as he proposes to afford them. It may be only a curious coincidence, but at this very moment the great United Church of Canada has started with a credal basis which affirms the very doctrine in question. The nineteenth article runs thus: "We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead; that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal." This represents Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational faith in Canada; so that evidently the pressure of the difficulty is not acutely felt in some quarters, at least not to the extent described by Mr. Martin.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS.

COMPARISON OF MASSORETIC AND SEPTUAGINT TEXTS.

[1. Four general considerations (see last month).]

2. The case against the MT stated and examined.
   - i. Hebrew MSS.
   - ii. Talmudic story as to editing of MT.
   - iii. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*; marginal readings.
   - iv. The Nash Papyrus.
   - v. The Vulgate.
   - vi. "Demonstrably wrong" readings in MT.
   - vii. LXX readings. Wiener's Tables examined. Conclusions. A more reasonable Table.

3. Some positive evidence in favour of the MT.
   - i. Herrmann's essay on the use of the Divine Names in Ezekiel.
   - ii. The Divine Names in Job.
   - iii. Baumgärtel on Herrmann.
   - iv. ctr. Hontheim's arithmetical calculations in Genesis.
   - v. Baumgärtel on reliability of MT.
   - vi. Coincidence of phraseological and other evidence with the use of the Divine Names in Genesis.
   - vii. Support given by Sam. Pent., Aquila, Peshitta, Vulgate.
   - viii. Reasonable explanation of LXX variants.

   Conclusion: The MT is reliable and the documentary hypothesis is sound.

Article 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM (*continued*).

Part III. The comparative merits of the MT and the LXX Text. In last month's issue we adduced:

1. Four general considerations (see EXPOSITOR for September).

2. We must now consider the alleged case against the Massoretic Text. No one in England has laboured more wholeheartedly to discredit the MT than Mr. H. M. Wiener.* Prof. Welch speaks of 'his clear cross-exam-

* Mr. Wiener has at times complained that his writings have not been accorded the careful consideration they deserved. I hope that he will

ination of the defence ' and ' his convincing insistence on its insufficiency.' *

Let us then see what sort of a case Wiener makes against the MT.

He attacks the MT on the ground that :

i. The existing MSS. (with one exception, of the seventh century) only go back to the ninth or tenth century A.D., and ' with slight exceptions represent but one official recension, the work of certain persons unknown (commonly called Massoretes) at some time unknown on critical principles unknown.' † The steps taken to secure accurate transmission have resulted in an extreme rarity of variants.

[For answer ‡ see Article 3 I (1) The Massoretic text, and (2) the Samaritan text, where we saw that Jerome, Origen, the Targums and Aquila shew that the Hebrew text current in their days was practically identical with the MT, and that the Samaritan text carries the same essentially similar text much further back still.]

ii. The MT was based on a single faulty archetype at a time when critical principles would not be well under-

recognize that I have done my best to consider and weigh the case he has presented. He has so frequently given vigorous expression to his opinions about the critics with whom he has disagreed that I feel sure that he will take in good part the outspoken expression of my opinion about his own arguments, and will welcome an honest effort to arrive at the truth, however much he may disagree with the conclusion arrived at. His studies are often so acute and suggestive, when he is not swayed by the wish to prove that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, that I cannot but feel that, if only he would abandon the attitude of Advocate for the attitude of Judge, though he might lose some of his present clientèle, he would greatly advance the cause of truth.

* I am not sure what Dr. Welch means by ' the defence ' which Wiener cross-examines. If he means Dr. Skinner's *Divine Names in Genesis* Wiener's *Reply* to that book seems to me most unconvincing.

† The passages quoted in this and the following numbered paragraphs are taken from Mr. Wiener's *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 10–41, and *The Pentateuchal Text, a Reply to Dr. Skinner*, passim.

‡ The passages in *square brackets* throughout the whole section are *my comments* on Wiener's arguments.

stood. A story is told in the Talmud (Taanith iv. 2), on the authority of a certain Rabbi, Resh Lakish, that the editors used three codices which were kept in the Temple, adopting in every case of difference the reading of the majority.

[Wiener quotes this story as Gospel Truth and, on the strength of this and similar Rabbinic traditions, mocks at the MT. Is it any more likely to be true than the well-known story as to the way in which the Seventy-two arrived at unanimity in their LXX translation? Wiener tells us himself that only four differences are mentioned in Taanith iv. 2 (only three according to Strack's art. "Text of the Old Testament," *Hastings' Dict.* iv. p. 731), none of any importance (one is seemingly corrupt Greek and, according to Talm. *Meg.* 9a, an alteration made by the Seventy-two). Wiener also quotes one of the 18 'corrections of the scribes,' as traditionally handed down, as shewing that the original text of Gen. 18^{22} ran: 'And Yahweh stood before Abraham.' This seems to be merely a daring conjecture. It has no single MS., version or quotation in its favour and intrinsic probability is altogether against it. But it serves Wiener's purpose of discrediting the MT, and therefore he quotes it as though it were unassailable.]

iii. "A glance at the margins of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* will show that according to such a modern scholar as Kittel the standard Hebrew has to be set aside *time after time on every page.*" * [One is tempted to take Wiener's "a glance" as indicating the kind of treatment which he has himself given to these margins. But the truth is that this is but a typical specimen of Wiener's exaggerated statements. Let us take at random 20 pages in Genesis in Kittel's edition (covering approximately Gen. 25 to 36). Excluding merely vocalic changes, Kittel sets aside the MT in 40 cases and

* The italics in the quotation are my own, not the author's.

queries 32 others, i.e. he actually sets aside on an average two readings per page. Many of the alterations are very trivial and are at best the opinion of one man. Kittel registers in the margin many other MS. and versional variants, but does not adopt them. And, be it noted, *not one* of the readings adopted by Kittel affects a Divine Name, although there are 67 such names in the 20 pages which we have examined. This is strong evidence that the Divine Names are a remarkably stable element of the Hebrew Text.]

iv. The Nash Papyrus has shown that Hebrew texts of the Law differing widely from the Hebrew-Samaritan, but strongly resembling the LXX, had currency in Egypt for centuries after the LXX translation was made. This proves that the Egyptian community were quite satisfied with the old Egyptian Hebrew text, the original ancestor of which broke off from the parent Hebrew stem *before* MT and Samaritan.*

[What is this Nash Papyrus ? It is a scrap of papyrus, now preserved in Cambridge University Library, which originally contained the Ten Commandments and the Shema (' Hear, O Israel,' etc.), written in cursive Hebrew. It was probably a scapula ; it has been folded once from top to bottom and four times across. Twenty-four lines survive. The two expert authorities upon it are Prof. F. C. Burkitt and Dr. S. A. Cook.†

The text of the ten commandments combines those of the MT in Exodus and in Deuteronomy, agreeing sometimes with the one and sometimes with the other. It

* The last point is an assumption, which Wiener has vainly tried to prove. See EXPOSITOR, Sept. 1911, and Skinner's *Divine Names*, pp. 125–135 and 276–281.

† Burkitt, *Jew. Q. Rev.* xv. (1902–3); S. A. Cook, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* (Jan. 1903); and see Canon Charles, *The Decalogue*, pp. xiii.–xliv.

probably shews the *liturgical* custom of the synagogues in Egypt at the time when the commandments were read daily before the Shema. Most of the agreements with Deuteronomy are also found in the LXX of Exodus, but not all, and the Shema is prefaced by an addition, which is found in the LXX of Deuteronomy 6^4, but not in the MT.

These agreements with the LXX shew that some things in the Greek also existed in a Hebrew text, but, says Prof. Burkitt, "there remains the more serious question, which is really *the better text*—that of Aquila and the Massoretes, or that of the Nash Papyrus and the LXX? In this case I must vote for the MT. The MT seems to me the more archaic and therefore the more genuine. . . .* MT here is the scholarly reproduction of an old MS., containing no serious errors, while the Nash Papyrus is a monument of popular religion, giving a text of the commandments with the grammatical difficulties smoothed down." The MT is not perfect, but "it does not follow that all the labours of the Sopherim were thrown away, or that every variant is a relic of a purer text. Especially is this the case with the Pentateuch." I have only given a tithe of the points in Prof. Burkitt's article, but I think that I have given enough to shew that the Nash Papyrus text, supported as it is by the LXX in a number of cases, is not the proof of the survival in Egypt of a purer Text than that of the MT, but rather of the reverse.]

v. The Vulgate proves that the MT often differs from the Hebrew text used by Jerome. In justification of this statement Wiener quotes an article by a Roman Catholic writer, Rev. Hugh Pope, O.P., in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* (Oct. 1913, pp. 375–398).†

* Cogent and detailed reasons are given here by Prof. Burkitt, which I reluctantly omit.

† *Reply* in *Bibl. Sacra*, pp. 241–244.

[Unfortunately for Wiener, when he wrote his *Reply*, Dr. Skinner's articles on *The Divine Names in Genesis* had not been republished in book-form. If they had, he would have realized upon what a broken reed he was leaning. In a supplementary note (pp. 281–288), Skinner shews (1) that 'the proved deviations of the Hebrew basis of the Vulgate from the MT are for the most part well within the limits of probable scribal error subsequent to the fixing of the standard text,' and that such divergence as exists in the highly technical sections which Mr. Pope selects in Exod. 35–40 is chiefly due to 'condensed paraphrase in translation'; (2) 'that Mr. Pope has fallen into the gross error of fancying that in the *Liber Hebraicarum Questionum in Genesim* Jerome is commenting on a Hebrew text,' whereas, 'apart from very rare and exceptional cases, it is as certain as anything can be that the *lemmata* on which he bases his exposition are taken (directly or indirectly) from the LXX; and the only doubtful question is whether he is citing the Old Latin version of the LXX or translating from the LXX itself.' 'Whatever Jerome is doing he is not translating from a Hebrew MS. His *references* to the Hebrew are frequent and detailed, and in no case (except beḥām for behām in 14^5) do they imply a consonantal text different from our MT'; (3) that Mr. Pope lays stress upon 12 omissions in chapters 1–11 of the Divine Name whereas 'no one with any sense of Hebrew idiom, or who has considered Jerome's practice as a translator, will have any hesitation in saying that the omissions did not occur in the Hebrew text that Jerome was translating.' In, e.g., Gen. 11^9 'the "Yahwe" could not possibly have been absent from the Hebrew and its omission in the Vulgate is due entirely to the substitution of the passive for the active construction.' As to the four cases in these eleven chapters (4^1, $6^{3,5}$, 7^9) in which the Vulgate (Clementine text) reads a different

name from the MT, in 4^{1} and 7^{9} there is strong MS. support for the name which agrees with the MT, and Cardinal Carafa, as we have seen (I 6), in both cases prefers the reading of the MT. 'After all there are only about *three* thoroughly attested variant Divine Names in the Vulgate of Genesis, the omissions being due to reasons of style.' As a matter of fact, 'there are a great many circumstances which conspire to reduce to a minimum the probability that any reading of the Vulgate goes back to a Hebrew independent of the Massoretic recension.']

vi. The MT in certain passages "is on internal grounds demonstrably wrong in its use of the Divine Names and the true reading has been preserved in a small minority of Hebrew or Greek MSS." * The passages adduced by Wiener are Gen. 4^{1}, 16^{11}, $30^{42.\ 27}$, 48^{15}, 14^{22}, 15^{2}, $31^{42.\ 53}$, Ex. 3^{1}, Gen. 28^{13}.

[It is impossible in this Article to deal with all the passages *seriatim*.

Let us take the first two as they come, and see whether in these cases Wiener has made good his claim.

(*a*) Gen. 4^{1}. Wiener argues that the man who wrote 4^{26}, "then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh," could not also have written that Eve said "I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh." To this there are two answers: (1) There is no necessary contradiction between the two. Wiener says that Eve could not have used the name Yahweh 'before it was known' (*Reply*, p. 266), but 4^{26} does not say that the name was not *known* before the days of Enosh, but that in his days men began to offer worship in that name. In $4^{4.\ 5}$, however, we have the bringing of offerings to Yahweh by Cain and Abel. The more satisfactory answer is that (2) 'independent narratives

* *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 17–19. *Reply*, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, pp. 257–264.

have been editorially combined within the group designated as J.' There are indications that $4^{1-16a.\ 17-24.\ 25-26}$ represent three such narratives * by different writers or at least from different sources. 'On internal grounds' therefore it is impossible to 'demonstrate' that 'Yahweh' in 4^{1} is wrong. It may rather be pointed to as shewing how scrupulously the Hebrew copyists adhered to their text, when on superficial grounds a change might have been deemed advisable. As to external grounds, the evidence is conflicting. The LXX unanimously reads *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, but Sam. Pesh. Vulg. agree with the MT. The LXX may here preserve the original name, but it is much more probable that the version, which reads 'God' for 'LORD God' at least five times in chapters 2–3, in chapter 4 reads 'God' in verse 4 unanimously, in verse 16 almost so and inserts it in verse 10, and reads 'LORD God' in $4^{6.\ 13.\ 15.\ 15}$, may have deliberately or accidentally substituted the reading 'God' in 4^{1}. There is certainly no demonstrably wrong reading in the MT here.

(*b*) Gen. 16^{11}. The MT explains the name Yishmaʿ-el (i.e. may El hear !) by the words : 'for Yahweh has heard.' This Wiener says is impossible. The original word must have been Elohim. When it is pointed out that Sam. Pesh. Vulg. and LXX (all 3 extant uncials, 19 cursives and 4 daughter-versions, as noted in the Cambridge Edition) agree with the MT, he replies that *one* Hebrew MS. reads Elohim and that the Old Latin and 2 cursives (bw) of the LXX support it, while 3 cursives (fir) read 'LORD God,' and that one Hebrew MS. reads El, corrected by the same first hand to YHWH. Truly a touching belief in minorities ! The whole contention 'on internal grounds' (as well as on external) breaks down, when it is realized that El and Elohim are not convertible terms. El is an

* See Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. ii., pp. 5–6.

archaic name, which had ceased to be used in ordinary speech. The explanation therefore had to be made by using one of the two current Divine Names, and a writer would naturally use that name which it was his habit to employ. 16^{11} occurs in a Yahwistic context and therefore Yahweh is used. In 21^{17}, where there is an apparent allusion to the same name, Yishmaʿ-el, the narrative is Elohistic and Elohim is used. The explanation of the name Samuel in 1 Sam. 1^{20}, where the MT is supported by Pesh. Vulg. and LXX (there are a good many MS. variants, but not one omits the *Κυρίου*), is an almost exact parallel.*

(*c*) I have not space to deal with the other passages. Dr. Skinner deals with $30^{24.\ 27}$ and 48^{15} (*D.N.*, pp. 54 f., 107). On external grounds we may conclude that Yahweh in 14^{22} is a gloss. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads Elohim, which may equally be a gloss. LXX and Peshitta omit. But on internal grounds alone it cannot be said that Yahweh in the mouth of Abram is demonstrably wrong. The other supposed demonstrable inferiorities of the MT prove on examination to be equally inconclusive.]

vii. The LXX "has preserved a very large number of readings that differ greatly from the MT. There is a preliminary question to be asked in using versions: does the text really represent a different Hebrew? If it is due to mistranslation or to desire to make the meaning clearer or to internal corruption, it is of no value for the criticism of the MT." [This is quite true, but Wiener goes on to say:] "This is not the case with at any rate the majority of the readings to be considered, for (*a*) support for renderings of the versions often comes from one or more Hebrew MSS. or from the Samaritan, or from both. [The answer to this has

* See Driver's note in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, pp. 13–15.

been given already in this Article, I 1 and 2, and III 1 iv.] (*b*) Extant notes as to various readings have come down to us, showing that LXX readings were supported by other authorities." [Wiener here refers to the fact that Origen on Gen. $4^{1\ \&\ 26}$ quotes 'the Hebrew' and in 4^{1} and 12^{8} quotes 'the Syrian' as agreeing with the LXX reading (see Field's *Hexapla*, p. lxxvii.). It is generally supposed that two unknown translators or commentators are referred to, but the reference is too obscure to be of any serious value. Wiener also points to Gen. 30^{24} where Aquila, Symmachus and the Syriac version agree with the LXX in reading 'God.' This is the one passage out of thirty-two, where Aquila deserts the MT in regard to the Divine Names. It seems to be a case of assimilation of the Divine Name to the 6 Elohim in the preceding seven verses.]

"For these reasons" (Wiener proceeds) "it is *certain* that the Versions do, at any rate in the *great majority* of cases where they differ from the MT, provide us with genuine Jewish variant readings, and this opens up the question as to the soundness of the MT with regard to the appellations of God."

[I have italicized three words in the above quotation from Wiener (*Essays*, p. 16). If Wiener here arrives so confidently at 'certainty' on such inadequate grounds, and if he jumps from a few questionable instances to 'the great majority of cases,' how can we put any dependence on his confident statements in other respects?]

Wiener goes on (*Essays*, pp. 17–19) to set forth cases in which, according to him, the Versional variant is on internal grounds demonstrably superior to the MT. [These I have dealt with under § vi. above], and he proceeds: "The LXX has also in a number of cases preserved readings demonstrably inferior, but in the great majority of cases the difference to the sense is nil. It is therefore only

necessary to show that these variants are extraordinarily numerous to cut away the ground from under the feet of the documentary critics."

[In *Essays*, pp. 24, 25 and 35, Wiener lays down Principles of Textual Criticism. Dr. Skinner has dealt with these in *Divine Names* (pp. 160–2 and 244 f.) and, to save space here, I must refer the reader to that book. But, in a word, one may say that the so-called ' principles ' are so laid down as to ' load the dice ' against the MT.]

Wiener in his *Essays* (pp. 26–40) gives a series of *five Tables*, purporting to set forth the ' extraordinarily numerous ' variants above mentioned. [I propose to comment on these Tables as briefly as is possible.]

Table I (p. 26) gives a list of seven readings in Gen. 2–3, where we know the readings of Origen's *Hexapla*. [Wiener in his *Reply* to Dr. Skinner acknowledges frankly that one of these readings (3^{23}) is non-existent. He had mis-read Field's *Hexapla* and had neglected to consult the Greek text, which would have speedily revealed his error.]

In 3^{1} Origen found ' Lord God ' in the LXX text he used, and in this reading the MT and all other authorities agree. In the other five Origen seems to have found God and to have added Lord, but Lucian (according to Lagarde) read ' Lord God ' in two out of the five, and codex A did the same in three. Wiener concludes this section with the question : What do higher critics say to this ? [We have already hinted at what one higher critic has said as to the ' colossal blunder ' in 3^{23}. As to 3^{1} MT and LXX agree. In the other five cases the Hexaplaric marks are good evidence as to the unrevised LXX text in Alexandria and Palestine, but the Lucianic and codex A readings shew that other readings may have co-existed in Syria and elsewhere, and at best the Hexapla only takes us back to A.D. 200 (i.e. 400 to 500 years later than the original LXX), and

at best only gives us the LXX text. It remains to be proved that it is superior to the MT. In every one of these six cases the Samaritan supports the MT.]

TABLE II gives the remaining cases in Gen. 2–3 where the MT has 'LORD God.' Wiener concludes that in four out of the thirteen [rather 'fourteen,' as 3^{23} was wrongly inserted in Table I] "it is absolutely clear that the original LXX text read 'God' alone." [I agree as to $2^{9.\ 19.\ 21}$, but in 3^{13} the evidence is fairly evenly divided between LORD God (= MT) and God. That leaves *ten* passages where LXX and MT agree, the variants in each case being negligible.]

TABLE III gives a select list of variants from Gen. 4 onwards. At its close Wiener remarks: "Probably few will doubt that in the great majority of the passages cited in this Table the LXX originally had a reading different from our present MT. [In estimating the significance of this Table it is important to keep in mind that the total separate uses of the Divine Names as proper nouns in the MT of Genesis and Exodus to 3^{14} are 324, and that the total *selected* examples in this Table amount to 43, i.e. just over one eighth. Of these I agree that 29, i.e. two-thirds, are clear LXX readings; 10 more are doubtful; the remaining four ought not to have been included at all, for one (15^{2}) is an Adonai Yahweh passage, and in three ($31^{42\ \&\ 53}$, 48^{15}) Elohim is used appellatively.]

TABLE IV gives twenty-one cases where LXX variants with very little authority in Greek are supported by Hebrew MSS. [Four of these should be eliminated. $15^{2\ \&\ 8}$ are both Adonai Yahweh passages, which, as we have seen (Art. 3 I 1), are notoriously liable to error. 6^{13} and 7^{16} are mere scribal errors.] "These coincidences," says Wiener, "are too numerous to be due to chance. In every case where any LXX authority presents a reading that differs from the

MT without any reason for supposing that the variant reading originated in the Greek, there is primâ facie evidence for suspecting a Hebrew variant." [We have already seen that coincidences were bound to occur when the possible variations were so extremely limited (III 1 iv above), and also that, except in the passages where Adonai or Adonai Yahweh occur, no single Hebrew variant is supported by more than three Hebrew MSS. (Art. 3 I 1). As a matter of fact in Wiener's Table only three Hebrew variants (after eliminating $15^{2.\ 8}$) are read by as many as two Hebrew MSS.

But the most important criticism of Wiener's contention is that if the same Hebrew MS. (or MSS.) presented a series of variant readings and was (were) supported by at least one or two LXX MSS. consistently, the coincidence would certainly point to an independent recension, but as a matter of fact the very opposite is the case. Eliminating the four passages, 6^{13}, 7^{16}, $15^{2.\ 8}$ (as above), 18 Hebrew MSS. are left. Only one of these appears more than once in the remaining list and, in the three variants this one shews, it never has support from more than one LXX cursive and in each case a different one. The LXX MSS. are almost equally various.

The verdict of impartial minds must surely be that the coincidences are due to chance. The two cases (3^{22} and 19^{29}) in which one Hebrew MS. (a different one in each case) coincides with a well-supported LXX reading are far too few to justify any conclusion to the contrary, and the sweeping generalization which Wiener deduces from his Table IV is seen to be built on the sand.]

Table V presents "all the variants of any consequence in a couple of selected passages" "in order to make it quite clear how frequently the reading is precarious." [The first passage is Gen. 6^{9}–9^{17}. Wiener gives 17 variants.

Wiener omits 6^{9}, $8^{1a,b}$, 9^{6}, because there are no variants in these cases, MT and LXX both reading 'God' unanimously, but by including them we get a more complete understanding of the whole case. This makes the total uses 21. Of these 21, 16 LXX readings are clear (eight agreeing with the MT, three adding LORD to the MT God, and five adding God to the MT LORD). It will be noted that out of these sixteen clear readings eight agree with the MT and the other eight are readings of LORD God. Now on p. 35 Wiener tells us that "LORD God in an enormous number of passages is a conflate reading." If that be true, then the conclusion seems obvious that the latter readings do not give the readings of the original and that in these cases also the MT readings have at least a very strong presumption in their favour. The remaining five LXX readings are doubtful, the variants equivalent to the MT being strongly supported, but balanced by other authorities in favour of one or other or both of the possible alternatives.

The second passage selected by Wiener is chapter 17. Here his singling out 'all the variants of any consequence' is arbitrarily applied and can only mislead anyone who does not carefully compare his presentation with the chapter itself. He omits verses ^{3,9} and ^{22b} because there are practically no variants, but verses ^{22a} and ^{23} should be mentioned alongside ^{18} and ^{19}. Verse ^{15} has already appeared under Table IV. But the outstanding fact is that throughout the whole chapter the overwhelming majority of LXX authorities are in agreement with the MT, and the evidence for the four variants tabled is so flimsy as to be not worth notice. The conclusion seems obvious that the MT throughout preserves the original text. But not so Wiener. Let him but find one Hebrew and one LXX cursive, even sometimes one alone (as in 17^{18}) and he is at once convinced that here is at least sufficient evidence to render the MT quite 'pre-

carious.' What he has unintentionally shewn is that, if any Text is precarious, it is the LXX Text. It in no way follows that therefore the MT is precarious. But now, fresh from our study of Table V, let us listen to Wiener's summing up of the argument, as given in his *Essays* (pp. 40–41).

" For sheer worthlessness as a test of authorship the use of the Divine Appellations by the MT would be difficult to surpass." " The MT is in some cases demonstrably wrong ; in an enormous proportion of other cases it is quite uncertain."

A writer who, after setting forth textual evidence after the manner of Table V, could append the above, can hardly be said to exhibit that ' accuracy, care, thoroughness and impartiality,' which he himself declares to be ' essential elements in scholarship,' and for the asserted absence of which he sets down all the critics with whom he disagrees as ' not scholars.' *

When one looks at the record of the witness upon which, in the main, Wiener so touchingly relies and observes how constantly its own text is unreliable or, on his principles, precarious and open to doubt, one is tempted to reply : " for sheer worthlessness as a witness to the original Hebrew Text of Genesis, where it differs from the MT, the LXX would be difficult to surpass. The LXX is in some cases demonstrably wrong ; in a large number of other cases it is quite uncertain." But there is no need to use exaggerated language. Let us rather recognize that in some 266 passages in Gen. 1–Ex. 3^{15} the LXX clearly confirms the MT.† Here we have a broad basis of agreement. What about the remaining 78 or (if we include the 9 (? 11) additional Divine Names in the LXX) 87 (? 89) passages ? Certainly we cannot accept them in bulk. " It is no part

* *Essays*, p. 1.

† See above (September No.), II 2.

of my contention," writes Wiener, " that the LXX is always right and the MT always wrong. . . . Neither line of transmission is infallible." * The LXX variant readings are certainly not better *per se*.

It is indeed notorious that the LXX contains many readings which presuppose a quite impossible Hebrew Text. In such books as Samuel, Kings and Ezekiel, the MT of which is in a far less perfect state than in the Pentateuch, emendations are frequently made from the LXX, but only when some superiority, real or fancied, attaches to the Text which appears to underlie the LXX reading. Unfortunately in the case of the Divine Names the test of intrinsic value in the ordinary sense fails us. Neither sense nor grammar is affected by the substitution of one name for another. The attempt to bolster up the witness of the LXX by adducing coincidences with stray variants in Hebrew MSS. completely breaks down.† Even in particular chosen cases, the LXX readings are not demonstrably better on internal grounds.‡ And when we examine the 87 passages in detail we find Wiener's " enormous proportion of cases " in which the MT is " quite uncertain " shrinks to very small proportions indeed. Mr. Wiener has given us five Tables. Let me give one in their place.

TABLE OF LXX VARIATIONS FROM THE MT. §

5 *omissions.* These do not affect the analysis at all.

25 *doubtful.* In 24 of these there is a well-supported variant agreeing with the MT. In the 25th (4^9) the LXX authorities are divided between LORD God and God, the double name suggesting an original LORD as in the MT.

20 *LORD God,* 16 times for MT Yahweh, 4 for Elohim. It is practically certain that all these readings are due to editors

* *Reply* to Dr. Skinner, p. 39.

† See Part III 1 iv at the end of the September instalment.

‡ See § vi, above.

§ References to chapter and verses will be found in the footnotes to the Table in the first part of this Article, II 3 (September, p. 180).

or copyists, and the strong probability is that in all these cases the MT gives us the earlier text.

4 *LORD* for MT Elohim. All 4 occur in passages in which the two Divine Names are commingled. In all 4, if we may judge by phraseological links with JE on the one hand and with P on the other, the probability is that the editor who combined JE and P retained the Divine Names as used in these documents (so MT), and that Greek translators or copyists, consciously or unconsciously, assimilated the names in these 4 cases to that which was prevalent in the context.

24 *God* (*a*) in 5 cases for MT Lord God. Why in Gen. $2^{5, 7, 9, 19, 21}$ the LXX reads God and, side by side with these, reads Lord God in $2^{8, 15, 16, 18, 22}$ no one, so far as I know, has ever been able to explain on any rational ground. The MT at least is consistent, the LXX is not. (*b*) In 19 cases for Yahweh. Prof. Welch early in his article of May, 1923, quoted the second Book of Psalms as a proof that an editor or editors had deliberately changed Yahweh into Elohim in at least some of the Psalms in that Book (see Art. 3, p. 165). "Now," he went on, "since we do not know when the change was made and have no certain clue to the reasons which led to the change, it is impossible to say that such an alteration of the Divine Names could only be expected in the Psalter. It may have influenced, if not the writers, at least the copyists, of the stories in Genesis." By 'It' I suppose Welch means: 'The same tendency.' If so, what he says is quite true. It may have. But, if so, what follows? Where do we find a similar tendency to change Yahweh into Elohim? Not in the MT of Gen. 1^{1}–Ex. 3^{15}, but in the LXX. In the MT there are 146 occurrences of Yahweh. In the same passages we find in the LXX 93 occurrences of *Κύριος*, 16 of *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, 19 of *ὁ Θεός*, 17 doubtful and 1 omission. It is clear that, if the Second Book of Psalms is to be our guide, so far from pointing to the MT, it points to the LXX, as the document in which the changes have been made.

78

9 *additions* * (7 of *Θεός*, 2 of *Κύριος*). These leave the analysis practically unaffected. Eight of the names are similar to

* Gen. $1^{7, 8}$, 4^{10}, 31^{44b}, 35^{9}, 43^{28}, 50^{24c} (2^{2} and Ex. 3^{12a} are also possible); 16^{8}, 19^{24d}.

those which prevail in the passages in which they occur. The ninth (*Κύριον* in Gen. 19^{29d}) harmonizes with the LXX reading in 19^{29a}. The two stand or fall together.

87

The above detailed examination of the whole number of clear and doubtful divergencies from the MT readings shews how unsatisfactory "an enormous proportion" of them are, if the aim is to recover the original Hebrew Text. I submit that on "cross-examination" (to use Welch's word) the case against the MT, based on the LXX evidence, has broken down. I now propose to adduce:

3. Some positive evidence in favour of the MT.

A good deal has been done in the last twenty years to demonstrate the reliability of the MT.

i. For example, Joh. Herrmann has written a very interesting paper on the Divine Names in the Book of Ezekiel, in which he has shewn that Ezekiel's usage can be reduced to a few simple and easily intelligible rules, and that with insignificant exceptions these rules are strictly observed in the MT.* The few exceptions (17 out of 447) clearly are transcriptional errors. On the other hand the LXX renders Adonai Yahweh in 5 different ways, including 143 *Κύριος* only. Clearly the art has strictly adhered to the usage of Ezekiel and the LXX has not.

ii. The usage of the Divine Names in Job is equally in favour of the MT.* In the MT the name Yahweh in the Dialogue is carefully avoided (the only exception, 12^{9}, occurs in a probable interpolation) and archaic names for God are almost exclusively employed, whereas in the prose introduction and epilogue and in the headings of speeches Yahweh is employed 30 times. In the LXX on the other hand the distinction of usage between the two parts is

* See Dr. Skinner's *Divine Names in Genesis*, notes on pp. 174–176 and 292–293.

obliterated and *Κύριος* is used 102 times in an indiscriminate manner.

iii. Baumgärtel (for whom see Art. 1, Supplementary note) draws attention to "one point to which too little attention is paid by those who put forward 'text-critical' misgivings: viz. that from inner-Massoretic observations it is possible to draw conclusions as to the textual certainty or uncertainty of the MT. And inner-Massoretic investigations must be undertaken. I would refer to the . . . irrefutable thesis of Herrmann regarding the Divine Names in Ezekiel. On inner-Massoretic grounds he has convincingly shewn the originality of the MT in the Adonai Yahweh passages." I think all competent scholars will agree with Baumgärtel in this. Nothing exposes the shallowness of Wiener's and Dahse's judgment more clearly than the way in which they set aside Herrmann's cogent arguments and facts and substitute a theory that the Hebrew editor of Ezekiel decided to use an almost equal number of Adonai Yahweh (217 and 218 respectively). It is true that no one could possibly have realized this, who didn't actually connect the names, and that no motive is conceivable which could have led any sane man to propose to himself so futile an artificiality, but that does not prevent their jumping at any theory which will give a semblance of excuse for preferring the LXX to the MT.

iv. In exactly the same way these two men take their stand upon Hontheim's arithmetical calculations in Genesis.* Anything more absolutely artificial and motiveless than the supposed methods of the Hebrew editor it would be impossible to imagine, and yet Wiener, while not accepting all Hontheim's calculations, declares that in his opinion the theory as a whole accounts for the difference between

* For Hontheim's theory see Skinner's *Divine Names*, pp. 292–294.

the MT and the LXX.* This judgment carries its own condemnation on the face of it.

v. Let me quote Baumgärtel again. "Looking back on the foregoing investigation as a whole, it can safely be affirmed that the use of Elohim in the present MT is not irregular or planless—that on the contrary it has been possible to establish a certain *normality* (Gesetzmässigkeit) in the use of Elohim (although I would not press the expression 'normality') : here and there it may be questionable, but in the main it exists beyond a doubt. This normality however can only be recognized, if the MT has not arisen through alterations, but lies before us as original text. If the MT were the result of alterations, this normality must be ascribed to the alterations, which in that case must have been systematic, extending over all the books passed under review. That is impossible. The normality can only be established on the assumption that the MT has not effaced the fact by alterations, but has faithfully transmitted the Divine Names. Thus for the trustworthiness of the MT in regard to the Divine Names we obtain a general point of view of essential importance : that this result is not to be mechanically applied to individual passages goes without saying."

vi. This normality in the use of the Divine Names in the MT does not stand alone. In both the first and second of these Articles we have noted the very significant fact that in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 6^2 the names Yahweh and Elohim closely coincide with the passages which on grounds of dual narrative, style and outlook have been grouped together into the three series known as J, E and P. This can be seen even in the LXX text from Gen. 12 onwards. It comes out more clearly and consistently in the MT. This coincidence speaks volumes for the trustworthiness of

* Wiener's *Reply*, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, p. 255.

the MT and the soundness of the documentary theory.

vii. It is equally significant that the Samaritan Pentateuch, Aquila, the Peshitta and the Vulgate (see Part I of this article) support the MT almost unanimously, shewing such a mere handful of divergencies that the only wonder is that, during such centuries of transcription, the number of them is so small.

viii. It remains to ask : if we do not accept the generality of the variant LXX readings as representing the original Hebrew text, how can we account for them ?

In Gen. 12^1–Ex. 6^2 these readings may be reasonably regarded as errors :

(*a*) Arising naturally during the long series of transmissions ;

(*b*) Due possibly in some cases to the unintelligent substitution of what editors or scribes believed to be the better reading.

In comparison with the Jews and the Samaritans the Greek copyists were somewhat careless ; the assimilation of a name to others in the context was all too easy ; but probably the main reason why ' God ' was substituted for LORD so much more frequently than LORD for God was simply that God came much more readily to the pen of a Greek scribe than the Hebraic LORD. In Gen. 2–11 the case is somewhat different. The divergencies are much more numerous. Here the hand of the Greek editor may have been at work. The reading LORD God occurs almost exclusively in these chapters and, as Dr. Skinner pointed out in his *Divine Names*, if the first of the two names represents the original in agreement with the MT, then the proportion of LXX variants to the MT readings in these chapters comes very fairly near to the proportion in Gen. 12–50. The MT usage is so strikingly confirmed by other criteria that it seems reasonable to regard some

of the 18 occurrences of LORD God and some other variations as consciously made, and the other variants as in 'nearly,' if not quite, all cases due to transcriptional error.

If the preceding considerations are duly weighed, the conclusion which will commend itself to judicial minds must surely be that the attack made upon the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Gen. 1–Ex. 6 has failed. The claim made that the witness of the LXX, where it differs from the MT, should outweigh the witnesses on the other side has not been substantiated. On the contrary the unreliability of the LXX text has been shewn and the substantial accuracy of the MT has been brought out. So far from the basis of the whole documentary theory having been "seriously shaken," it stands unshaken and I believe unshakable.

J. BATTERSBY HARFORD.

JESUS AND ART.

LOWELL in one of his poems tells the tale of a prophet who, feeling that God had forsaken him, set out for a certain holy hill in the belief that there if anywhere upon earth His presence still lingered, and on the hillside he prayed for a sign and listened for an answer to his prayer. But there was no burst of thunder, and not even a murmur stirred the air. Only the tuft of moss before him opened, and a tender violet appeared; and at the sight of it he remembered that ere he entered on his journey his child had run to him, holding in her hand a flower just like this, which she had plucked beside his very door. He had no need, therefore, to fare away to a far-off holy hill to see the homely flower, or to seek the Presence whose glory stood over the threshold.

The prophet had fallen into the ancient error of thinking

that in order to believe in God he must needs see signs and wonders and come before His presence in some specially appointed meeting-place apart. If he had only trusted in his nature, as the poet says, and learned to look for God in the things of home and at hand, he would have seen that God is revealed in the known and not hidden in the unknown, and is to be found of all them that seek Him where they are.

Now it is a signal part of the witness of Jesus, meaning by witness not merely his few reported sayings but his whole attitude in silence as well as in speech, in life as well as in teaching, that God is such that He is to be found and known not through any vastness or through any vacancy spread betwixt Himself and the soul of man, but in and through all things that move the soul to love. Jesus looked with the same eye upon nature as upon humanity, the eye with the long deep gaze in it before which nature could not but unfold like a flower before the sun, the eye of the heart

"That watches and receives."

Amid the labours of his life it was his wont to turn aside and look upon nature not as a pilgrim only, or a passing guest, but as one at home in the meadows and among the mountains and there where the silences and far horizons could be deeply felt and could feed "the happy stillness of the mind." Hence it was not merely out of the midst of a single bush that burned with fire upon a sacred mount apart that Jesus caught the vision of his God, but in the common flowers of the field, and in the fowls of the air, and even in the sparrow falling to the ground.

One of the marked features of his personality and one peculiarly his own when he steps upon the stage of history is his ingrained habit of going away into desert places and to the heights of mountains.

"How use doth breed a habit in a man."

Thus he is no sooner baptized and conscious of his task than he is led up of the Spirit into the desert that there in the solitude and space he might think out the mighty apocalypse which had rent the heavens and revealed him to himself: and scarcely has he begun to preach and to heal and to cast out demons before it is recorded that "in the morning, a great while before day, he rose up, and went out and departed to a desert place," and again, so rapid is his early fame, and the popular excitement so intense that he must needs escape from it all for the time being: "He could no longer openly enter a town, but stayed in the country, in desert places." And on a later occasion, under the stress of a similar necessity, he says to his disciples: "Come you yourselves apart to some desert spot, and rest a little while." In every case, as it will be observed, it was an inner need or purpose which impelled him to withdraw at the bidding of a spirit which craved the solitudes of nature almost as it craved the souls of men. May we not recall in this connexion what Wordsworth says of Nature.

> "A Power
> That is the visible quality and shape,
> And image of right reason; that matures
> Her processes by steadfast laws;
> trains
> To meekness and exalts by humble faith;
> Holds up before the mind intoxicate
> With present objects, and the busy dance
> Of things that pass away, a temperate show
> Of objects that endure."

Mark and Luke both relate that he "there prayed." Sometimes, worn in body, and sometimes disquieted in soul, it was his to regain the power which had passed from him, and to receive

> "Authentic tidings of invisible things,
> And central peace subsisting at the heart
> Of endless agitation."

And, frequently, for the same besetting need or purpose of the spirit "He goeth up into the mountain." Luke mentions that he went out into the mountain to pray and "he continued all night in prayer to God." That was just before the choosing of the Twelve, and it would seem that either before or after some such decisive moment of his ministry, Jesus was in the practice of taking to the heights. "Great things are done when men and mountains meet," says Blake, and nowhere is the truth of that so evident as in the life before us. The mountains, like the wilderness, were no small factor in his growth as in the ripe product of his grace and truth.

Thus it is profoundly significant in this connexion to find it stated—by Luke alone—that at the close of his career, "during the days he was teaching in the temple; but during the nights leaving (the temple) he used to go and lodge on the hill."

Wordsworth says that the language of the hills,

> "Aids the thoughts,
> However multitudinous to move
> With order and relation."

and of one, a herdsman, whom he knew, that

> "Early had he learned
> To reverence the volume that displays
> The mystery, the life which cannot die;
> But in the mountains did he *feel* his faith,
> All things responsive to the writing, there
> Breathed immortality, revolving life,
> And greatness still revolving; infinite;
> There littleness was not; the least of things
> Seemed infinite, and there his spirit shaped
> Her prospects, nor did he believe—he *saw*."

Now of Jesus, too, going out, as his custom was, to the mountains at times so fraught with destiny, may it not be said that there his spirit shaped her prospects and he saw? Faith rose to the pitch or point of vision. And things,

" all things " were revealed to him of his Father and power was with him to reveal. Lesser things as well as greater, the flowers arrayed in beauty at his feet, the fields white to harvest, the wild birds tended in their flight, and the sparrows unforgotten in their fall, such things as these no less than the " mysteries " of the kingdom and the spirits of the blest. There is no trace in him as in so many of his followers of any hiding of his face from the life of nature for fear that its beauty, its wonder, or its power would steal away his heart from God. No one who tries to appreciate the witness of Jesus as a whole can charge him with gloom or asceticism, or with a form of piety that moves men to forsake the body and flee from the dear life of earth. " I cannot read the New Testament," says Symonds, " the *Imitatio Christi*, the *Confessions of St. Augustine*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress* without feeling that Christianity in its origin, and as understood by its chief champions was, and is, ascetic."

Now it must be admitted that many of the followers of Christ, and even his chief champions, so to name them, have been ascetics, pursuing the narrow way as they perceived it, intent upon an aspect of the truth, as if it were the whole, and often in their haste desiring naught except the fire from heaven which he himself refused to bid. Consumed with their own zeal rather than with his, a zeal to destroy, they forgot to fulfil, thus wrongly dividing, or giving a wrong direction to, the word of truth, and meriting the rebuke of the early writer who describes them as " men who prohibit marriage and insist on abstinence from foods, which God created for believing men who understand the truth to partake of with thanksgiving. For everything that God has created is good and nothing is to be refused so it be received with thanksgiving, for then it is consecrated through the word of God and through prayer."

This great utterance—even supposing Paul is not the author of it—is the utterance of a primitive Christian who was of the same mind as Paul and of the same mind as Jesus himself. It were enough, perhaps, to recall a single passage like Mark vii. 19, "thus he pronounced all food clean." But there is more than a single passage or many passages, there is his whole witness in silence as in speech, in practice as in preaching, in what lies in the background as well as in what appears in the foreground of his Gospel. For the word of truth as it flows in parable and precept from his anointed lips and from the deep breathings of his spirit covers and enshrines the whole of life without and within. Thus it is God Who clothes the grass of the field, and Who makes the sun arise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust. He is the Lord of heaven and of earth. Heaven is His throne and earth the footstool of His feet. An able writer has said that "almost all Christ's moral sayings might be paralleled or illustrated by something in Hebrew or Jewish literature. The praise of the beauty of flowers cannot apparently be so paralleled. Of all Christ's sayings it is the most original." "Consider" (Luke has "fix your mind upon") "the lilies of the field how they grow! They toil not, neither do they spin; Yet I say unto you, even Solomon in all his splendour was never robed like one of these." "In the first century," as the same writer says, "it must have seemed a paradox of paradoxes that the glory of Solomon's clothing is not so great as that of a flower." Even yet its "marvellous originality" is but little understood. The truth is that Christ was long before his time in this creative utterance, and it would be possible to show that it was only gradually, "here a little and there a little," that the arts began to catch up with his profoundly spiritual view of nature. A sense or sensibility like his, so fresh, spontaneous and deep,

must have been in him from his youth, and have grown with the vast conceptions and ideals which more and more became his own as he strove with them in lonely places and in watches of the night and day. And, perhaps, one might here suggest that a poem like *The Prelude* of Wordsworth, with its finished picture of the growth of a soul through fellowship with nature, has that in it which may help one most of all to appreciate something of the inspiration and the discipline by which the spirit of nature, manifestly an abiding power in Jesus' life, far more so even than in that of any Hebrew sage or poet, acted on his soul and wrought in him the passions which strengthen character, and the pieties which exalt it.

Jesus has often been presented as an enthusiast, almost indeed, as a fanatic concerned about the coming of the kingdom of heaven, and about the last things, but little if at all about the present time and tide in the affairs of men. He was no reformer of society of the usual or even of the prophetic type. He made no attempt, for example, by agitation or revolt to change the form of government which hung like a millstone around the neck of his people. He moved in another plane of things, and, as one has said, "he roused a spirit which moved in another plane than that of resistance or submission to imperial power." But to say that Jesus was absorbed in a kingdom and a crisis that lay within the future, and within the sovereign will of God alone, and that his "ethics," is only a sort of code in keeping with the passing stage or interval preceding this event is strangely to overlook, for one thing, and it is but one of many, those serene and songful words of which "consider the lilies" is the chief, the keynote, as it were, of them all, which express his sheer delight in "the mighty world of eye and ear," and in the present personal reign of the Father, Lord of heaven and earth. As this is not the time

or the place to discuss the difficult problem of the kingdom it may be enough to say that no solution of it will be found by ignoring a group of sayings which forms such a vital and original part of the recorded thought of Christ. His thought is too free, imaginative, spiritual to be forced within the limits of a single doctrine of the future ; and indeed it is far less his thought that is on trial now as the thought of those who try to interpret parts of it as if they were the whole and who turn its flower of poetry into the dust of prose.

The truth is, and one may not forget it, that Jesus brought the poet's eye to nature, the poet's insight or his second sight, and what he saw he sang with the poet's truthfulness and charm of speech. Everywhere he touched things common till they rose to touch the spheres. He shot his teaching through with pictures drawn from the loveliness of a world whose life he loved like his own in God. With a rare understanding he drew nature in and made it one of the strings of the instrument upon which he discoursed the music of the gospel. And this was nature not only as a " realm of pleasance " close at hand with its dayspring and its rain, its seasons and their fruits and flowers, its trees and the birds lodging in the branches thereof, but also as a realm of solitude far withdrawn, of desert places and moutainous retreats : " Regions consecrate to oldest time! " It was with the same eye he looked upon the things beneath him and looked up to the hills above him. It was with the same mind " steeped in feeling " he went through the cornfields and resorted ofttimes to the wilderness. He was equally at home in the near and the far. Hence, surely, it was from no mere ascetic impulse that he betook himself so often to the solitudes like one content to live the silent life secluded and alone. The solitudes might be his favourite haunt of prayer, but prayer was a task to him and a tryst

as real and urgent as his preaching to the poor. The one was as much a choice of his spirit as the other, and so, apparently, were the spots of earth appropriate to each. Both by speech and action, then, by his witness here "in the midst," and there "by Himself alone," Jesus shed upon nature a new light, full of warmth and colour, and such as has little in common with the pale and ghostly light of asceticism.

It would, indeed, be true to say that nature became a new world from the day that Jesus dwelt among its trodden and untrodden ways, and found it everywhere so friendly to his spirit, instinct with a life that mingled with his own, and that helped him both to apprehend and body forth his thought of God. The tidings which it brought were all of one with the tidings which he came to proclaim. It was one of the "all things" handed over to him by his Father to reveal. Its message, therefore, was a joyous message, like a repetition of the first creative word "it was very good."

How very good is shown by this that in all that he beheld

"From this green earth,"

in the seed growing up spontaneously, and in the blade and the ear and full corn in the ear, in the bloom of the flower and the bounty round about the creatures, as well as in the ministries of sun and sea and those shrines among the hills, Jesus recognized and adored the same Spirit of beauty and beneficence Whose presence he cherished and confessed in the depths of his soul. If he gazed upon the things he beheld with the long deep gaze of which he spoke he reaped the harvest of it in that intense love, or, that open vision of the spiritual life of nature which was not only a foretaste of, but the active participation in the creative joy of the Father. And one of his ways of revealing to men the Father Whom he knew was by teaching them to inquire of nature

and by inquiring to admire, until the spiritual life within, the love and the loveliness alike, kindled in their hearts a kindred joy to his own. Only by fixing the mind, by gazing intently, by giving oneself up without thought of self to "watch and receive" is it possible for men to enter into and abide in Jesus' joyous experience. No one can be said to "listen to his voice" unless he hears the ringing cry of joy in such words as these: "even Solomon in all his glory was never arrayed like one of these." "If God so clothes the grass which blooms in the field to-day, how much more shall he clothe you." "Not one of them will fall to the ground without the knowledge of your Father. Fear not, therefore, you are worth far more than sparrows."

There is a charm in these words, a glamour as of a new-born day upon the sea which recalls what Sir Philip Sidney says about the poet: "He beginneth not with obscure definitions which must blur the margent with interpretations, and load the memory with doubtfulness; but he cometh to you with words set in delightful proportion, either accompanied with, or prepared for, the well-enchanting skill of Music; and with a tale forsooth he cometh unto you, with a tale which holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney corner."

It is sometimes said that our Lord did not argue, but simply made assertions and left them to make their own impression on the mind. But it is to be observed that there is a striking mode of argument which he was wont to use, and which nature in a sense supplied. Only one profoundly sympathetic to the spiritual life of nature could ever have made such use of it. From time to time in conversation and address he begins with some phase of truth upon the plane of nature open and familiar to his hearers, and from this being admitted, he proceeds to a higher phase which thus, by comparison, becomes intelligible and clear. On

one occasion being asked "is it right to heal on the sabbath day?" he replied by asking a question which allowed of but one reply: "What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out?" And from this he passes to the truth which follows of necessity, "How much more is a man worth than a sheep. Thus it is right to do good on the sabbath day."

And as he used this simple but conclusive form of thought to unfold his doctrine of the worth of man, and of man's relationship to man, so he applied it to express the truth about the Father and His Fatherhood. "Look at the wild birds, they sow not, neither do they reap . . . and yet your Father feeds them. How much more will He feed you who are worth more than birds?" "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? Yet not even one of them is forgotten by God. Fear not, you are worth far more than sparrows." "Look how the lilies grow, they neither toil nor spin, and yet what a glory is theirs, nay, look but at the common grass in the field, its texture like the lilies', finer far than any silken thread of man's device, its swift and fruitful growth across the naked soil until the soil is clothed with pastures green, and is meet for the various use of man. Now if God so clothes the grass in the field . . . will He not much more clothe you?" The argument is sound, it is lofty common sense, it is profound wisdom, part of the wisdom in which he grew through long communings with the life without him and within. And it is worth noting here that it is the same argument which men have adopted, and been driven to adopt, by reason or by faith or both, when they have turned now like Mungo Park from the depths of woe, and now like Wordsworth from the heights of wonder and felt "A Presence that disturbs me with the joy of elevated thoughts."

Mungo Park relates that on one occasion he considered his fate as certain, and that he had no alternative but to lie down and die. "At this moment, painful as my reflections were, the extraordinary beauty of a small moss in fructification irresistibly caught my eye. Can that Being (thought I) Who planted, watered, and brought to perfection in this obscure part of the world, a thing which appears of so small importance look with unconcern upon the situation and sufferings of creatures formed after His own image? Reflections like these would not allow me to despair. I started up and disregarding both hunger and fatigue travelled forward assured that relief was at hand; and I was not disappointed."

The argument "how much more" is one of those lucid openings into the mind of Christ which disclose the order and direction of his thought, his way of thinking things together, relating them to one another and to the unity within which they fall. The world in which he dwelt was not a world only visited at times, or haunted here and there by an elusive power, but was everywhere and at all times the abode of the one Father who is such that he adorns the flower and the field, and gives of His bounty to the creatures great and small, and reveals all this to the "babes." To Jesus moving about so freely, and without fear like a child in the home, God moved in no mysterious but ever in a luminous and friendly way His wonders to perform. Hence it would be a mistake from Jesus' point of view to think that God is present mainly in the unfamiliar and remote, in miracles and portents and rendings of the heavens, in secrets and in sources patent to the few. Since, in truth, there is not a spot of earth where the seed is sown and grows apace, or where the sparrow falls but is sacred to His presence, and if only men have eyes to see and ears to hear, there is not a blade of grass but speaks the ancient oracle:

" Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

Thus by this homely but original mode of thought Jesus cleared away a mass of cloud and darkness from the face of God, and the problems of the wise and learned vanished in the visions of the simple-minded. Men have been wont to think of God as a God Who hides Himself, and have paid respect to priesthoods and the like who have sought His presence in sequestered shrines and in " dim religious light." As if God does not clothe Himself with light as with a garment, and is not fain to reveal Himself, and as if God is not Love, and must needs be loved and known. The truth is that men are upon a wrong track with their priesthoods and agnosticisms and their dark misgivings of His " divine simplicity." Whereas in going the way of Jesus' thought it is theirs to begin with the manifestations of God rather than His mysteries, and instead of peering here and there for glimpses of the vast enigma to catch the shining of His countenance in the beauty and bounty of the present world.

And, what if there are tares among the wheat and thorns that choke the seed, and scorching heat, and what if there are tempests beating down the houses built on the sand, and falling towers that kill, and all the evils that afflict the bodies and the souls of men, and even if " an enemy hath done this," yet things innumerable as these, and Jesus did not fail to observe them, failed to disturb the order of his thought or break its inward harmony. Just because there was no unkindness in his heart and never a breath of malice or of hate, he refused to believe that this or that was any stain upon the radiance of his Father's love. " If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your Father give the Holy Spirit from heaven to those who ask Him." Here is another instance

of the kind of argument which Jesus used, and it opens up a further reach of truth.

He has been out among the fields gazing fondly on the handiwork of God, and now he goes into the homes of men to find the same substantial evidence of God therein. The home no less than the flowering field is all a witness to His Fatherhood. As before, he starts with something open and familiar in order to present the truth as he beholds it. It is nothing distant or abstruse, but simply the common lot of the ordinary household. And once again he shows that there is no impenetrable veil obscuring the Divine, but that the elements of right thinking and true belief are close beside us, in our hands and homes. To Jesus heaven and home were always "kindred points." Here, then, is the home consisting of a small community closely knit together by the bond of love which is the bond that makes it possible. But the love is a many-coloured thing, and now its tone is tender and now severe. And whilst the nature of parental love is to give, yet its giving does not always answer to the wishes of the child, but rather to the deeper impulse which is fain to help and not to harm, and which would not give a stone for a loaf or a scorpion for a fish. Taking it all in all the home is where they know how to give what is good to their children. And thus if parents for all their evil are faithful to the soul of goodness in the home, does it not stand to reason, "how much more will your Father in heaven give good gifts to those who ask Him?"

Now it was in this way all so simple and so sure that Jesus set free the significance of the home as he set free the significance of nature. As he widened nature without going beyond it, so he widened human nature without going beyond it. He made them both reveal the whole to which they belong. Or, in other words, he drew out their luminous background, and set them both upon it as the

great poet or painter does in dealing with his theme. It is given to the seer,

> "To see the world in a grain of sand,
> And a heaven in a wild flower;
> Hold infinity in the palm of your hand
> And eternity in an hour."

And Jesus, by virtue of the same expansion of sight, by insight, by imagination which is reason in her most exalted mood, caught up the facts or factors as a whole which make nature and human nature what they are, and seeing what he saw, he said what he said. His language is the language of vision even though at times it is cast in the form of argument.

Nothing was farther from the workings of his mind than the idea of "a Godless nature and an unnatural God," a mechanical world-order and an external world-architect, or world governor who "lets the world swing round his finger." It was Jesus' great idea that nature in general, and human nature in particular is inseparably bound up with the Divine, and that neither the one nor the other can be seen or known save in the light that lighteth it. And it was this idea reigning in and radiating through his personality that made it so many-sided, and at the same time so harmonious and one. It was the secret of his "sweet reasonableness," that subtle virtue, as one has shown, so pervading all the strata of his being that "in Christ alone among men we have faith without dogmatism, enthusiasm without fanaticism, strength without violence, idealism without visionariness, naturalness without materialism, freedom without licence, sacrifice without asceticism, purity without austerity, saintliness without morbidity, a light which was too strong to dazzle, a fire which was too intense to flame."

It is chiefly in his attitude to men, as one might expect, that this subtle virtue appears rising to an appreciation of

man beyond even that of nature. Or, more truly, one might say that it is the same original attitude to nature carried to a farther point in keeping with the facts. For the appreciation of the one flows from the same source as the appreciation of the other, and follows the same new imaginative line, but in relation to humanity it touches a height of thought and action which stands by itself alone. Appreciation is the capacity to see and to say, and if it was such in Jesus that it lifted up the humblest of growing things in nature into a new and rare significance which it has taken a length of ages to perceive, disclosed the inner in the outer life, it accomplished as much and more as regards "the least of these his brethren." His principle is, as we have seen, that if God clothes the grass of the field, and forgets not a single sparrow, He will much more clothe men and remember men since they are worth more than sparrows. It was always in the light of this his essential worth that Jesus regarded man and spoke and acted towards him. It is summed up in the one word: "For what could a man give in exchange for his soul?" Hence he took and set man, so instinct with soul, in the midst of the minute and comprehensive care, or providence,

> "that knows no insulated spot,
> No chasm, no solitude; from link to link
> It circulates, the Soul of all the worlds."

and bade him to be faithful in a very little and faithful also in much, and to be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Wordsworth in *The Prelude* following closely the same line of imaginative thought speaks of

> "that bursting forth
> Of sympathy, inspiring and inspired,
> When everywhere a vital pulse was felt,
> And all the several frames of things, like stars,
> Through every magnitude distinguishable,

Shone mutually indebted, or half lost
Each in the other's blaze, a galaxy
Of life and glory. In the midst stood Man
Outwardly, inwardly contemplated,
As, of all visible natures, crown, though born
Of dust, and kindred to the worm; a Being,
Both in perception and discernment, first
In every capability of rapture,
Through the divine effect of power and love;
As more than anything we know, instinct
With godhead, and by reason, and by will,
Acknowledging dependency divine."

Now this new and lofty and unrivalled sense of the worth of man, or what man has it in him to become, (thus finely drawn out by one of the great interpreters of the mind of Jesus) underlay his every approach and appeal, and explains his dynamic influence, the faith, the hope, the love he evoked in men and still evokes. The Gospels form a kind of gallery of scenes, in the foreground of each of which stands Jesus face to face with one or other of those who have sought his presence, and now he looks upon and loves them, and now he knows their thoughts, and now he answers their spoken or unspoken need. Now he stands still at the voice of their cry, and now he takes them by the hand, or lays his hand upon them, and now he only says "with a word." Even his enemies are drawn to exclaim "This man welcomes or, is on the look out for sinners, and eats with them," bearing unwilling and unwitting witness to the truth. "A man to be greatly good," as Shelley says, "must imagine intensely and comprehensively, he must put himself in the place of another and of many others: the pains and pleasures of his species must become his own. The great instrument of moral good is the imagination."

James Robertson Cameron.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE LUKAN AUTHORSHIP OF THE THIRD GOSPEL AND THE ACTS.

To the student of New Testament problems the Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts represents a familiar and well worn track. Some justification is necessary, therefore, if he is to be asked to tread it afresh. The need lies in the fact that recent criticism has challenged widely accepted positions. In *The Beginnings of Christianity* St. Luke's authorship is rejected, not only by the Editors, but also in an acute and well-informed essay ("The Case against the Tradition") by Professor H. Windisch (Pt. I, Vol. II, pp. 298 ff.). It is probable that the conclusions here reached came to most English scholars as a surprise, for, thanks to the labours of Harnack, Ramsay, Hawkins, Stanton and Moffatt, St. Luke's authorship of the Gospel and the Acts had come to be regarded as a reasonably established position.

It is, I think, very unlikely that *The Beginnings of Christianity* will seriously disturb this conviction, although in certain matters, notably the "medical argument," henceforward the case will be stated more cautiously.[1] In the present article an attempt will be made to review the question in the light of the essay mentioned above.

Professor Windisch clearly admits the deficiencies of the Tübingen theory and "the advantages of the traditional opinion." He recognizes that Paul "is a party-man, engaged in combat; and, as a partisan, naturally one-sided" (p. 317), and he refers to Dr. C. H. Watkins' book, *Der Kampf des Paulus um Galatien.* "There is therefore a possibility,"

[1] It should be remembered that long ago Stanton declined to lay too much stress on the medical argument, although he was a strong supporter of the Lukan authorship. See *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II, pp. 261 ff.

he adds, " that the account may be correct as it appears in Acts, even if it conflicts with Paul's, or even if he is silent on the subject." We may say at once that if this admission, and Watkins' arguments generally, had been allowed their proper force, a good deal of Professor Windisch's essay need not have been written. Much the same may be said of the further recognition of the fact that when a Lukan report about Paul or Peter appears unhistorical " it does not follow that Luke would have been able to recognize it as such, and would therefore have been incapable of accepting it as true " (p. 317). We shall see how surprising these admissions are in the light of the phenomena which are thought to turn the scale against the theory of Lukan authorship. Other instances, not decisively to the disadvantage of " the traditional opinion " are found in the account of the conversion of Paul, the reference to his first visit to Jerusalem and to his principle of first searching out Jews in strange cities (pp. 318 ff.). Windisch does not think it safe to reject summarily the report of the circumcision of Timothy, nor the story of Paul's compliance with James and with the Elders (p. 320 f.). When we remember that these points have figured again and again in the case for the denial of St. Luke's authorship of the Acts, it is impossible not to see how far we have moved from the doctrines of Tübingen criticism. All the more surprising is the confidence with which the negative argument is defended by the considerations which remain. The bed-rock of Windisch's position is his view of Acts xv. As he himself says, " For the critical investigator the decisive point must always be the ' Lucan ' presentation of the Council of Jerusalem " (p. 321).

It is a matter for regret that the " Case for the Tradition " was limited in *The Beginnings of Christianity* to the position so ably advanced by the late C. W. Emmet, the view that

St. Paul's second visit, as he describes it in Galatians ii., is that referred to by St. Luke in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. In saying this no disparagement is suggested of a position which has won for itself strong support in the hands of Spitta, Zahn, Ramsay and others. All that I am urging here is the fact that the theory has a very vulnerable side of which full advantage is taken. In the treatment of Professor Windisch a single sentence dismisses this theory. "We must first block the clever and convenient exit which is offered by the refusal to admit the comparison of Galatians ii. with Acts xv. on the ground that Paul's story refers to the second visit to Jerusalem which Luke mentions in xi. 30, xii. 25" (p. 321). It is safe to say that if Dr. Watkins' bold identification of Galatians ii. 1–10 and Acts xv. had also been selected as defining the "traditional opinion," so triumphant a sentence could not have been penned. It is equally certain that the positions which Windisch proceeds to unmask would have seemed very much less formidable. According to Professor Windisch there are three conflicting statements in the account of Acts xv. which no skill can explain away.

The first ground of objection is the speech of Peter (Acts xv. 7–11). "Could a man who had known Paul have allowed Peter to claim that God had long before made him the apostle of the Gentiles?" (p. 323). In part, the question may be answered by two others. How far did St. Luke know the Paul who wrote Galatians, and what weight are we to attach to Professor Windisch's recognition of the fact that Paul is "a party-man," who, "as a partisan," is "naturally one-sided"? For the rest, Professor Windisch's argument is effectively answered in the claim made in the first volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity*: "It is one of the mistakes of the Tübingen School that it did not recognize that Peter, not only in Acts but also in the

Pauline Epistles, is on the Hellenistic, not the Hebrew side" (p. 312). The second conflicting statement is found in the speech of James (Acts xv. 14–21). The use made of Amos ix. 11, 12, is thought to prove that the speech must have been composed by the author of the Acts. "It is improbable that anyone who knew from Paul's account what position James took (cf. Gal. ii. 11 f.), could have fabricated for him such an interpretation of Scripture" (p. 323). But do we learn so very much from Galatians ii. 11 f. of the position taken up by James? The passage tells us that under the influence of "certain" who came "from James," Peter drew back from eating with Gentiles. From this we probably learn something of the opinions of James as to social intercourse between Jew and Gentile, but nothing whatever as to the terms under which Gentiles might be admitted to a share in the Gospel. We may, if it is necessary, attribute the quotation from the Septuagint to St. Luke without denying his authorship of the Acts. Moreover, we must not forget to put down to his credit the fact that he so far knows the scruples of James as to include in his speech the four restrictions which later are embodied in the Apostolic Decree.

The third objection rests, as we might expect, in the Decree itself. The Decree is a food law, and, as such, must necessarily have been mentioned by St. Paul. Paul "could not have failed to discuss the Decree and its correct interpretation" (p. 325). "It would have been a crushing retort to the Judaisers" (p. 326), and, if historical, would certainly have been imposed on the Corinthian Church from the beginning. This is a well-beaten path to the student of the Acts, and it is strange that these arguments should be stated as if no reasonable answer were possible. If the case stood at its worst, the Lukan authorship of the Acts would not thereby be disproved. St. Luke might have

included in his story of the Apostolic Council a decree which in reality belonged to a later time. The assertion of Professor Windisch that to a companion of St. Paul it must have been on the face of it too palpable an invention to include it in his narrative, is an overstatement. It accepts too naïvely St. Paul's statements at their bare face value, and measures by too narrow a standard the opinions of which even a companion of St. Paul might have been capable. We are very far, however, from being shut up to the view that the Decree is unhistorical, or even wrongly placed in the narrative. Dr. Watkins is amply justified in claiming that even in the Decree the main point is not the imposition of restrictions, but the proclamation of Gentile freedom.[1] If, moreover, St. Paul is silent about the restrictions, he is equally silent about the positive side. It ought boldly to be recognized that St. Paul may well have accepted the restrictions contained in the Decree, without assigning to them the importance they may have had for James, or anything like the significance which they have come to possess for Professor Windisch and all who think like him.

Leaving Acts xv., we must now consider the treatment which Windisch accords to the "We-Sections." It is important, however, to note that he comes to the consideration of this question in the light of the results he has reached in the case of the Apostolic Council. His position is that the author of Acts took over St. Luke's diary, and for literary reasons, or possibly through carelessness, failed to mention the name of St. Paul's travelling companion (p. 329). Neither of these explanations can be accepted.

[1] "This liberation of the Gentiles is, according to Acts, the main result of the Council and the main purport of the Decree. The specially-mentioned exceptions have come to be thought both more important and more severe than they originally were" (*St. Paul's Fight for Galatia*, p. 209).

Had the author of the Acts wished to retain the "we" for "literary reasons," it is difficult to think that he would have contented himself with the bare use of the first person plural, while "carelessness" does not explain the retention of a feature which Windisch himself describes as "a rather astonishing characteristic of the 'We-Sections'" (p. 329). The traditional view, that the diarist is identical with the compiler of the Acts, and uses the first person to indicate that he was present during the events narrated, is much the simplest and most satisfying explanation. This view, moreover, is substantiated by the linguistic parallels and the communities of thought and standpoint between the "We-Sections" and the rest of the Acts. The rejection of this really adequate explanation of the "We-Sections" is part of the price which has to be paid when Acts xv. is viewed as the work of a post-apostolic writer. But so artificial are the theories to which, in this case, we must have recourse, that an added reason is given for doubting the truth of the initial assumption.

Little additional force is supplied by pressing the difficulties found in chapters xvi.–xxviii., outside the "We-Sections." Much that is here written, we are told, "cannot have been narrated by an eye-witness" (p. 330). The account of the journeys of Paul and Silas (xvii. 14 ff., xviii. 5) is incorrect; "and it is difficult to suppose that 'Luke' here had been wrongly informed" (p. 330). The procedure of Professor Windisch might be described as a set of variations on such airs as these. Thus, the speech at Athens is un-Pauline, and it is "surely more probable that the author . . . had not known Paul" (p. 331). Even the farewell-speech at Miletus "seems improbable," and the words of Jesus in Acts xx. 35 are "perplexing." "Why was not so fine a saying inserted in the Gospel? Surely it would have been, if 'Luke the physician' were the *auctor*

ad Theophilum " (p. 331). Again, when the Acts mentions " only as an afterthought and incidentally " what to St. Paul was the chief reason of his journey to Jerusalem, viz., the delivery of the moneys he had collected, " the hearsay character of the evidence is manifest " (p. 332). As for St. Paul's conversion, " ' Luke ' would have most certainly mentioned the ' seeing of the Lord ' upon which Paul founded his apostleship " (p. 332). Why, moreover, three accounts ? " Luke would undoubtedly have known what Paul was accustomed to tell about his call to be an Apostle to the Gentiles and can scarcely have written such varying accounts " (p. 333). Then there is the story of St. Paul's defence before the Council ! The picture implies " hypocrisy on the part of Paul," while to attempt to harmonize it with Philippians iii. 2 [1] is " an insult to Paul." As regards what is told about St. Paul and the Jews at Rome, " we can never believe that it is the reminiscence of an eye-witness about the most important days in the history of the most successful and greatest Apostle of Jesus Christ " (p. 336).

Perhaps the most effective reply to such criticism is its detailed statement. Professor Windisch appears to have forgotten the excellent principle which he stated at the outset, that even in the case of an apparently unhistorical report " it does not follow that Luke would have been able to recognize it as such, and would therefore have been incapable of accepting it as true." No one will deny that in some of the points to which Windisch refers real difficulties are raised. But they are not unknown to those who retain the traditional position. They are really formidable only if we ignore the excellent principle which Professor Windisch himself states, and if we take at their full value such passages

[1] " Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, beware of the concision."

as Philippians iii. 2, while closing our eyes to St. Paul's words in 1 Corinthians ix. 20–22:

"And to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak: I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some."

These words show how far St. Paul could go in the way of accommodation, and this as a matter of principle. "He was pre-eminently a man of action, and in such a man one is apt to find, on occasion, a certain extremeness and ruthlessness in dealing with opponents, while on other occasions negotiations are entered into with opponents, and compromises are made, which cause the greatest anxiety to his supporters. The reply of the man of action to these rebellious supporters, who claim to be defending his own principles against his betrayal, is that compromise is justified by circumstances of which they cannot judge." (Watkins, *op. cit.*, p. 299 f.)

Objection must also be taken to Windisch's treatment of the stories about St. Paul before the commencement of the Apostolic Council and the "We-Sections" and the non-Pauline traditions of Acts i.–xii. Nobody pretends to have a complete solution of St. Luke's treatment of the gift of tongues at Pentecost. There is force, however, in the suggestion that in Acts ii. he is working-up a source which described the phenomena as a linguistic marvel. Moreover, evidence has yet to be supplied that St. Luke had intimate knowledge of the Corinthian Church and must have known exactly what the *glossolalia* was. Very much less difficult

is the story of the conversion of Cornelius. The assertion that the story is "flatly contradicted" by Peter's hesitation in Antioch, is much too strong. After all, St. Paul himself tells us that before certain came from James, Peter had eaten with Gentiles. A step so decisive as this requires explanation, and if we had not the story of Cornelius, we should require something very much like it in order to account for Peter's liberal action. That later he should have faltered, and for a time have withdrawn from his bolder attitude is surely not difficult to understand. To suggest that the story of Cornelius is unhistorical in view of what happened in Antioch, is hasty criticism. The suggestion leaves half the latter incident unexplained, and for the rest is psychologically unsound. The utmost which might be claimed is that St. Luke has embellished a story in which he obviously took pleasure. With Dr. Burkitt we may justly say that the incident "seems . . . to fit the character of Peter and his subsequent conduct too well to be mere invention" (*Christian Beginnings*, p. 105).

For Professor Windisch the denial of the Lukan authorship of the Gospel naturally follows in the wake of his views regarding the Acts. The only further argument presented is the remark: "It would be very strange—one can of course not say more—if the fullest of the synoptic Gospels had been written by a pupil of Paul, while the Pauline Epistles rather ignore the synoptic tradition" (p. 344). All that need be said here of this consideration is that it furnishes another illustration of the delusion that a "pupil of Paul" is an echo of Paul. Professor Windisch answers his own argument by the terse statement that the Paulinism of St. Luke is "a fiction" (p. 344).

We may sum up our discussion of Professor Windisch's argument by saying that if he gives "the case against the tradition," the verdict must be "not proven"; and this,

as we shall see, is tantamount to a much more positive conclusion. The essay is extremely able, but it is doubtful if, apart from its concessions to the traditional position, it contains a single argument which has not been previously met by Harnack, Hawkins, Ramsay, Stanton, Moffatt, Watkins and others. The severest count against it is its practical neglect of excellent principles of investigation which are actually stated in the chapter. The essay is not wanting in knowledge, but in that broader sympathy without which historical investigation is foredoomed. The attitude of St. Paul and the treatment of St. Luke are viewed from too narrow a standpoint. The writer is too certain as to what St. Luke would not have written, too well-informed about the fixity of St. Paul's opinions, and the result is that he presents a form of argument which forty years of Lukan research ought to have antiquated. Canon Streeter has recently laid down a valuable principle which is very much to the point in connexion with the subject under discussion. This principle is stated as follows : " The burden of proof is on those who would assert the traditional authorship of Matthew and John and on those who would deny it in the case of Mark and Luke " (*The Four Gospels*, p. 562). In view of the tendency, visible in the early Church, to ascribe the New Testament books to Apostolic writers, this is a very reasonable position to take up. If we accept this view, the failure of *The Beginnings of Christianity* to show just cause why we should desert a position which rests upon early ecclesiastical tradition, unity of lexical and grammatical usage and communities of thought and doctrinal standpoint, encourages us still to maintain the view that St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, is in the full sense the author of every part of the Lukan writings.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

WHILE many will feel in agreement with the theory of Professor E. F. Scott, put forward in his work on the Fourth Gospel, that the Holy Spirit in St. John is to be regarded as identical with the Risen and Eternal Christ, one cannot be altogether satisfied with the inference he draws from it, namely, that St. John's conception of the Spirit has therefore actually no intrinsic value. Professor Scott, it is true, does not leave entirely unexplained how a doctrine of the Spirit has appeared in the Fourth Gospel. It is an instance, he tells us in his chapter on the Holy Spirit, "of that tendency everywhere prevalent in the Gospel, to conserve the traditional belief alongside of the new and deeper interpretation." In representing the divine power at work in the Church as the Spirit of Christ Himself, John had advanced a stage beyond the teaching of St. Paul. The latter had looked for an outward Parousia—a return of Christ upon the clouds of heaven, and had regarded the Spirit as ministering to mankind in the interval. But St. John grasped the underlying truth in the idea of the Parousia, and interpreted it as inward and spiritual, and as already accomplished. Instead, however, of discarding the now superfluous Pauline theory of the Spirit, he suffered it to survive alongside his own new and deeper conception of Jesus' return. This is Professor Scott's explanation, and his conclusion, to use his own words, is, that "the more closely we examine the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, the more we are compelled to acknowledge that there is no real place for it in the theology as a whole. All that is vital in it is contained already in the grand conception of the return of Christ as an invisible and abiding presence."

Assuming Professor Scott's explanation to be a full one, we can scarcely object to his conclusion. One cannot but be impelled, however, to ask the question: Does his view do justice to St. John? Perhaps, to do justice to Professor Scott, we should point out here that he does allow the doctrine of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel a certain relative value, namely, that by his allusions to the "Spirit of Truth," St. John brings into special prominence that aspect of the abiding work of Christ which the character of the Christian revelation as progressive signifies. But even this modification does not affect his general conclusion, clearly expressed elsewhere, that "all that is essential in the doctrine of the Spirit has already been expressed under other categories." But further, Professor Scott affirms not only that there is no real place for a doctrine of the Spirit in St. John, but that it even complicates and weakens the central Johannine message of the spiritual return of the Exalted Christ. Is it now, not a matter for some surprise that, having penetrated to the true meaning of the Parousia, St. John should then have allowed his teaching to become entangled and obscured by certain of the very thoughts and ideas from which it was its chief merit that it had broken away? Moreover, when we observe how explicit are the Johannine statements about the coming of a spiritual presence perfectly distinct from Christ Himself, even the "Comforter" or Helper, and how clearly they are set over against and contrasted with Christ's promises of His own return, is it not suggested to us that the writer may have had some definite object in view? Briefly, we think that there are grounds for believing, not only that it is an error to regard St. John's doctrine of the Spirit as superfluous to his teaching, but that in it we may discover one of the most vital features of his Gospel, and, indeed, perhaps one of the chief reasons for its existence.

In the Supper discourses in the Fourth Gospel we have Christ represented as promising His own return after His death, and in the same breath announcing the coming of another to carry on His work, but Who is yet apparently independent of Himself. It is this seemingly strange contradiction, which has made the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit such a problem for theology. It appears to us, however, for certain psychological reasons, that on the assumption that it was really to His own Spirit to which Jesus is to be understood as referring when He spoke of the Helper, it was important that some such alternative term should be employed, if the Christian Faith was to be preserved intact for future generations, and if men were to reach an inward and truly spiritual apprehension of an Omnipresent and Eternal Christ.

Let us consider with a view to explaining our meaning, how, supposing Jesus had wished His disciples and those who came after to know that He would be always with them in the Spirit if not in the flesh, He might have expressed His meaning and what the results of each method would be. Let us first imagine that He had simply said that He would come again, without explaining the manner of His return. In this event His followers would interpret Him literally, and His continued non-return in the flesh would in time become a grave problem for those who awaited it, and place a great strain upon their faith.

Let us assume now, however, that, coupled with a promise of personal return, He had explained that He would not come back in the flesh, but would be among His disciples after His Crucifixion as Personal Spirit. This is the method we should have expected Jesus to have adopted, if on the one hand He wished His followers to realize that they were not to look for His physical restoration, and, on the other, if they were to identify the spiritual influences at

work after His death with His continued presence amongst them. It is therefore important to understand the danger and the risk accompanying this method.

It is pretty clear that for all who had come in contact with the earthly Jesus, their thought of Him and their religious feeling generally, would, after His death, gather about the memory of that incomparable historic personality. Even if those who were conscious of quickening spiritual influences remembered that Jesus had promised to be with them afterwards, and that they were to expect to feel His power in their lives, they would nevertheless interpret His spiritual existence in the present in terms of their concrete experience of Him in the past, and they would thus associate their present religious experiences less with an Eternal Christ than with a temporal Jesus. And even for those who had never seen Jesus in the flesh, so long as actual memories of His earthly life lasted and were handed on as tradition, their thought of Him would be bound up with the thought of events which had taken place in the past, instead of with personal experiences which were going on in the present. So long as the primitive Christian tradition persisted, it would be only natural for men to be always harking back to the past, for the reason that it is easier even for a well-educated mind to recall a concrete memory than to grasp any abstract conception. And in the case of the disciples and early followers of Our Lord this would be especially true, for we know that the majority were not men of culture trained in methods of abstract thinking. It is certain that the psychological symbols by which they would represent to themselves Christ's presence with them in spirit, would be their concrete memories of His life in the flesh. Thus it would come about, that in their minds any new spiritual experiences would tend to gather round this concrete centre, so that

the thought of Christ which formed the psychological foundation of all their religious life and feeling would be largely simply their own memory of Him or memories handed on from others. The chief result of this would be, that, after a time, when those recollections of Jesus' earthly life were beginning to fade, there would be a very serious risk that with them would perish many of the thoughts vital to living faith, and that in the disciple's minds the religious complex, of which memories of His life upon earth had been the centre, would break up completely.

But supposing now, and to consider a third possible method, that as well as promising His personal return and referring to it at times as a spiritual coming, Jesus was represented as telling in addition of the coming of another spiritual being altogether distinct from Himself, would not the danger of which we have spoken be eliminated, or at least minimized ? Indeed by the introduction of the notion of another spiritual presence, such as the conception of the Spirit in St. John's Gospel involves, and the employment of that alongside of the promise of a personal return, is there not provided an intellectual foundation for the proper apprehension of a purely spiritual return on the part of Christ ? Is there not provided a new point of departure for men and women in their thinking about Jesus, a starting point that will remain uninfluenced by the ravages of time, and that will have for its objective counterpart not the human Jesus limited by conditions of time and space, but the Risen and Eternal Christ Himself ?

To put the matter shortly, it seems to us that in St. John's doctrine of the Spirit there is furnished a new psychological nucleus as it were, around which, equally with that centre which the memories of Jesus' earthly personality constituted, would gather all the qualities ascribed to Jesus, and all the ideas and religious sentiments generally which

had been associated with His Person. The essential thing to notice is that this new centre, as perfectly independent in the minds of those in whom it was planted from the other centre or nucleus, would escape the fate of the latter resulting from the gradual fading of the memories of Jesus' life upon earth ; and that because around it, as around the historic memory, had gathered all that was divine, permanent, and vital in the life and message of Our Lord, it would unify and preserve those elements for posterity, after all that was purely human, and local, and temporary, had perished. We may roughly illustrate our meaning here by thinking of two ships at sea. One of them is gradually sinking. But the other is standing by. Thus before she sinks, her entire crew, representing all that is essential and vital, are transferred to a place of safety on board the seaworthy vessel.

The strength of this theory of the doctrine of the Spirit in St. John is found not only in the reconciliation it offers between two apparently discrepant ideas, but also in the actual historical situation with which the writer was contending. The Fourth Gospel was, we believe, written at a very critical period of the Church's history and at a time when faith was at an ebb. One of the reasons for this decline was simply that many who had looked for a return of Jesus in the flesh were now perplexed and disappointed. But we have already noted how John had understood the real character of Jesus' return, that indeed He was already present. It seems to us in the highest degree probable, therefore, that the introduction of this alternative term was connected with his object of bringing home to his readers the fact of their Lord's presence, and that the idea of the Spirit was taken over from St. Paul with the view of helping men to grasp the truth that they could enjoy Christ's real companionship,

although He had not come back to them amidst clouds of glory as they had anticipated.

But another reason for the ebbing tide of faith was that the memories of Christ's earthly life were, in fact and as a matter of history, becoming dim. As Professor Scott himself says, after describing the tendency as one destructive of vital faith : "There were those who clung to the mere reminiscence, which was fading more and more into the distance. Their religion was wholly a matter of tradition, and was destitute of inward impulse and spiritual reality." This gives further weight to our theory, for it was on the assumption of precisely such a threat to faith as this, that we showed the Johannine teaching on the Spirit as of the utmost value and significance.

Finally, it might be regarded as an objection to the foregoing theory that it appears at first sight unduly elaborate and even far-fetched. This difficulty largely vanishes, however, when we realize that what we have been able to explain only by careful psychological analysis and reconstruction, may well have seemed relatively simple and obvious to one living as St. John, amidst all the actual contemporary conditions. But it is not our purpose here to discuss the psychological insight of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, rather only to contend, that in his treatment of the Spirit, St. John performed an inestimable service to the later Church. The author of the Fourth Gospel in his doctrine of the Spirit may not unlikely have accomplished for the Christian Religion a service similar to that achieved by St. Paul in another direction. One of the greatest tasks which the latter undertook, was the repudiation of the old Judaistic and legalistic notions of morality, which by their recrudescence, judging from such a letter as his Epistle to the Galatians, had become a grave menace to the welfare and growth of the Church. The issue here

was simply the truly spiritual and universal character of the Christian Faith.

But we know that John too, in his time—assuming his gospel to have been written about the beginning of the second century—saw Christian beliefs threatened and harassed on many sides, and on one by a crude interpretation of the meaning of Christ's return. What John achieved by trying to help men to grasp the fact that their Lord was truly with them we cannot estimate, nor how far he may have contributed to the development and the understanding of the Christian Verities in more modern eras. One thing at least is clear. The issue in this case was nothing less than the truly spiritual and universal character of the Risen Christ Himself.

Ian G. Simpson.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

V.

xiii. 1, 2. *Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.*

In the famous challenging Septuagesima sermon, preached on February 11, 1498, Savonarola told the Florentines: "Man's perfection consists not simply in faith and law but in charity; he only who has charity knows what is needful to salvation. Nowadays we have nothing but laws and canons and controversies; but the apostles had fewer laws, because they were aflame with love and charity. All theology, all canon and civil law, all ecclesiastical ceremonies are ordained with a view to charity, and all the world has been made by God for charity. Then on him

who issues commands opposed to charity, which is the fulness of our law, *anathema sit.*"

Hazlitt, in *Table-Talk*, declares that his friend Joseph Fawcett, "almost the first literary acquaintance I ever made," was, "I think the most candid and unsophisticated. A heartier friend and an honester critic I never coped withal. He has made me feel (by contrast) the want of genuine sincerity and generous sentiment in some that I have listened to since, and convinced me (if practical proof were wanting) of the truth of the text of Scripture, 'That had I all knowledge and could speak with the tongues of angels, yet without charity I were nothing!'"

Matthew Arnold applies this to Heine :—

> "But was it thou—I think
> Surely it was!—that bard
> Unnamed, who, Goethe said,
> *Had every other gift, but wanted love;*
> Love, without which the tongue
> Even of angels sounds amiss?"

Goethe meant Platen, however, not Heine. In his "Conversations with Eckermann" (Christmas Day, 1825), he remarked: "We cannot deny that Platen has many brilliant qualities, but he is wanting in—*love.* He loves his readers and his fellow-poets as little as he loves himself, and thus we may apply to him the maxim of the apostle—'Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.' I have lately read the poems of Platen, and cannot deny his great talent. But, as I said, he is deficient in *love*, and thus he will never practice the effect which he ought."

xiii. 4, 5. *Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil.*

When Dr. Johnson was once ill, he asked his friend Langton to tell him candidly his faults. Langton brought a paper with some texts, including this one, recommending Christian charity. When Johnson asked him how he had failed in this, Langton declared that he sometimes contradicted people in conversation. Burke's comment on this was, "It is well, if when a man comes

to die, he has nothing heavier upon his conscience than having been a little rough in conversation."

xiii. 5. *Love . . . seeketh not her own,*

Sir Walter Raleigh, says Froude in his *English Seamen* (ch. vi.), "was engaged in a hundred schemes at once, and in every one of them there was always some taint of self, some personal ambition or private object to be gained."

"Each for himself, his family, his heirs;
For the wan, weltering nations who concerns, who cares?"
Hardy, *The Dynasts* (vi. 6).

is not easily provoked.

"Love," says George Eliot in *Daniel Deronda*, "has a habit of saying 'Never mind' to angry self, who, sitting down for the nonce in the lower place, by-and-by gets used to it."

"Everybody must have observed in his fellowmen, and he must be a very excellent or a very obtuse person who has not observed in himself, at least a tendency, requiring to be guarded against, to exaggerate not merely personal offences, but personal neglects, slights, and other *misères*. It is hardly too much to say that presumed negative inquiries of this kind rankle in sensitive dispositions even more than open and positive attacks or affronts."

Professor Saintsbury in *The Peace of the Augustans* (p. 197).

xiii. 7. *Believeth all things,*

In 1834 Whately wrote to Newman: "It is a rule with me, not to cherish, even on the strongest assertions, any belief or even suspicion, to the prejudice of anyone whom I have any reason to think well of, till I have carefully inquired and dispassionately heard both sides. And I think if others were to adopt the same rule, I should not myself be quite so much abused as I have been."

When Gladstone introduced his unfortunate Oxford University Bill, in 1853, John Bright, the ablest of its protestant dissenting critics, "told the House of Commons that he did not care whether so pusillanimous and tinkering an affair as this was passed or not. Dissenters, he said with scorn, are expected always to manifest too much of those inestimable qualities which are spoken of in the Epistle to the Corinthians:—'To hope all things, to believe all things, and to endure all things.'"

Morley's *Life of Gladstone* (bk. iv, ch. 4).

hopeth all things.

"We are never authorized to abandon our country to its fate, or to act or advise as if it had no resource. There is no reason to apprehend, because ordinary means threaten to fail, that no others can spring up. Whilst our heart is whole, it will find means or make them. Because the pulse seems to intermit, we must not presume that it will cease instantly to beat. The public must never be regarded as incurable."

Burke, *First Letter on a Regicide Peace.*

xiii. 9. *We know in part.*

Newman confesses, in the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, how he once recollected Hurrell Froude's words to him, almost his dying words, "I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing. What good can it do? and I call it uncharitable to an excess. How mistaken we may ourselves be, on many points that are only gradually opening on us!"

xiii. 11. *When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child:*

"Alas!" says Coleridge of himself, "I had all the simplicity, all the docility of the little child, but none of the child's habits. I never thought as a child, never had the language of a child."

But when I became a man, I put away childish things.

"By what test, by what indication, does manhood commence? Physically by one criterion, legally by another, morally by a third, intellectually by a fourth—and all indefinite. Equator, absolute equator, there is none. Between the two spheres of youth and age, perfect and imperfect manhood, as in all analogous cases, there is no strict line of bisection. . . . It is a fact, forced upon one by the whole experience of life, that almost all men are children, more or less, in their tasks and admirations."

De Quincey, *Autobiographic Sketches* (ch. xiii.).

"Do as a child but when thou art a child," says Sir Thomas Browne in his *Christian Morals* (iii. 8), "and ride not on a reed at twenty. He who hath not taken leave of the follies of his youth, and in his maturer state scarce got out of that division, disproportionately divideth his days, crowds up the latter part of his life, and leaves too narrow a corner for the age of wisdom;

and so hath room to be a man scarce longer than he hath been a youth."

Compare Goldsmith's criticism, in "The Traveller" (149–154), of the Italian character in the eighteenth century :—

> "Here may be seen in bloodless pomp arrayed,
> The pasteboard triumph and the cavalcade;
> Processions formed for piety and love,
> A mistress or a saint in every grove.
> By sports like these are all their cares bequited,
> The sports of children satisfy the child."

Hazlitt, in *The Spirit of the Age*, declares that Canning "has merely engrafted a set of Parliamentary phrases and the technicalities of debate on the themes and school-exercises he was set to compose when a boy. Nor has he ever escaped from the trammels imposed on youthful genius; he has never assumed a manly independence of mind." In his essay *On a Sun-Dial* he recalls Rousseau's story of "his sitting up with his father reading romances, when a boy, till they were startled by the swallows twittering in their nests at daybreak, and the father cried out, half angry and ashamed, 'Allons, mon fils; je suis plus enfant que toi!'"

xiii. 12. *Now I know in part:*

"We know that the invisible world cannot be duly discerned, or perfectly appreciated. We know that we see as in a glass darkly; but still we look on the glass. We frame to ourselves some image which we know to be incomplete, which probably is in part untrue, which we try to improve day by day, of which we do not deny the defects—but which nevertheless is our 'all'; which we hope, when the accounts are taken, may not be found utterly *unlike* the known reality. This is, as it seems, the best religion for finite beings, living, if we may say so, on the very edge of two dissimilar worlds."

Walter Bagehot, *Literary Studies*, ii. 261.

"Madam," Samuel Rutherford wrote to Viscountess Kenmare, "ye must go in at heaven's gates, and your book in your hand, still learning."

"These scientific individuals have been nowhere but where we also are; have seen some handbreadths deeper than we see into

the Deep that is infinite, without bottom as without shore. . . . To the Minnow every cranny and pebble, and quality and accident, of its little native Creek may have become familiar: but does the Minnow understand the Ocean Tides and periodic Currents, the Tradewinds and Monsoons and Moon's Eclipses; by all which the condition of its little Creek is regulated, and may, from time to time (*un*miraculously enough), be quite overset and reversed? Such a minnow is Man; his Creek this planet Earth; his Ocean the immeasurable All; his Monsoons and periodic Currents the mysterious Course of Providence through Aeons of Aeons."

Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus* (iii. 8).

But then shall I know even as also I am known.

"Still we say as we go,—
'Strange to think by the way,
Whatever there is to know,
That shall we know one day.'"

D. G. Rossetti.

"O purblind race of miserable men,
How many among us at this very hour
Do forge a life-long trouble for ourselves,
By taking true for false, or false for true;
Here, through the feeble twilight of this world
Groping, how many, until we pass and reach
That other, where we see as we are seen!"

Tennyson, *Geraint and Enid.*

Describing the death of Schiller, Carlyle tells how "about six he sank into a deep sleep; once for a moment he looked up with a lively air, and said, *Many things were growing plain and clear to him.*"

"When we speak of things so much above our comprehension, as the employment and happiness of a future state, doubtless it behoves us to speak with all modesty and distrust of ourselves. But the scripture represents the happiness of that state under the notions of *seeing God, seeing him as he is, knowing as we are known*, and seeing *face to face*. These words are not general or undetermined, but express a particular, determinate happiness. And I will be bold to say that nothing can account for, or come up to

these expressions, but only this, that God himself will be an object to our faculties, that he himself will be our happiness."

Butler, *Sermons* (xiv. § 19).

xiii. 12. *And now abideth faith, hope, charity:*

Compare the saying of John Eliot, the apostle of the Indians: "My understanding leaves me, my memory fails me, my utterance fails me; but I thank God my charity holds out still."

But the greatest of these is charity.

"A rational philosophy sanctions and perpetuates those vague yearnings that arose in the last provisional system of religion, and marks as the highest boons that man can know the three grand conditions of all social life, Faith, Hope, and Love. The first of these forms the inward impulse of unity; the second supplies us with its external basis; the last, closely connected with the activity, becomes at first the result and then the stimulus of each of the other two. This simple order indeed seems disturbed on occasions of anarchy in public or private life, and it would then appear that Hope only is left behind, without which indeed any life is impossible. But a mere careful study shows us how, even in these cases, Hope is then dependent on a system of affection and belief, a discipline of life which insensibly remains after its foundations have been removed. Besides, the too common tendency to despair in nations and in men proves how much, in such exceptional cases, Love and Faith are indispensable to Hope." Comte.

"A man's love is the measure of his fitness for good or bad company here or elsewhere. Men are tattooed with their special beliefs, like so many South-Sea Islanders; but a real human heart, with Divine love in it, beats with the same glow under all the patterns of earth's thousand tribes."

O. W. Holmes, *Elsie Venner* (ch. xvii.).

"Though my marriage was a wreck," said Thackeray, "I would do it over again, for behold, love is the crown and completion of all earthly good."

In the twenty-ninth canto of the *Purgatorio*, "the three Ladies dancing and singing at the right wheel of the Chariot," says Dr. Carroll in *Prisoners of Hope* (p. 425), "are the three theological virtues in their ideal purity." Dante means to suggest their

relationship. "Sometimes Faith led the dance, and sometimes Love: Faith, because to love God and hope in Him we must believe that He is; Love, because nothing quickens Faith and Hope like Charity. Hope never leads, because it is dependent for its very existence on its sister-virtues. And finally it is the song of Love which determines the movements of the dance, swift or slow, Love being the 'royal law,' the great commanding virtue, which gives the right order and measure to man's life."

xiv. 1. *Follow after love; yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy.*

When the Scots clergy objected to Cromwell's soldiers preaching, Cromwell in 1650 used this text in his reply and defence: "You say, you have just cause to regret that men of civil employments should usurp the calling and employment of the Ministry. . . . Where do you find in the Scripture a ground to warrant such an assertion, that Preaching is exclusively your function? Though an Approbation from men hath order in it, and may do well; yet he that hath no better warrant than that, hath none at all. . . . You know who bids us covet earnestly the best gifts, but chiefly that we may prophesy; which the Apostle explains thus to be a speaking to instruction, and edification, and comfort —which speaking, the instructed, the edified and comforted can best tell the energy and effect of, and say whether it be genuine."

xiv. 8. *If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?*

The motto chosen by Newman and his friends, in 1833, for the advertisement of "Tracts for the Times."

xiv. 12. *Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church.*

"Those who meet within the church walls on Sunday should not meet as strangers who find themselves together in the same lecture-hall, but as co-operators in a public work, the object of which all understand and to his own department of which each man habitually applies his mind and contriving power. Thus meeting, with the *esprit de corps* strong among them, and with a clear perception of the purpose of their union and their meeting, they would not desire that the exhortations of the preacher should be, what in the nature of things it seldom can be, eloquent. It might cease then to be either a despairing and overwrought appeal to feelings which grow more callous the oftener they are thus

excited to no definite purpose, or a childish discussion of some deep point in morality or divinity better left to philosophers. It might then become weighty with business, and impressive as an officer's address to his troops before a battle."

Sir John Seeley, *Ecce Homo* (ch. xviii.).

xiv. 19. *In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.*

"Resign the rhapsody, the dream,
To men of larger reach;
Be ours the quest of a plain theme,
The piety of speech."

R. L. Stevenson.

xiv. 20. *Brethren, be not children in understanding; in understanding be men.*

"I am quite sure," Dr. Arnold wrote in 1837 to an old pupil, "that it is a most solemn duty to cultivate our understandings to the uttermost, for I have seen the evil moral consequences of fanaticism to a greater degree than I ever expected to see them realized; and I am satisfied that a neglected intellect is far oftener the cause of mischief to a man than a perverted or overvalued one."

xiv. 26. *When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.*

"It is fortunate for the world in the long-run," says J. B. Mozley in his *Essays* (vol. ii. p. 256), "that all the men who come forward to instruct and enlighten it are not cast in the same mould, and that some, according to their natural bent, reason, and others prophesy. There is a depth of mind which explains itself and unfolds its ideas in regular order, and there is also a depth which asserts itself, which throws out its contents, to produce their impression and make their way as such. The former is the more perfect method humanly, the latter is more divine."

"Here lies the rich deep power of music, one of the most Christian of its elements, because it corresponds most with the drawings of sympathy, brotherhood, and membership one of another. As an historical fact, musical harmony is a development of the

Christian age and of the Christian church, and partly because it offered musical expression for that sense of loving affinity and rich co-operation which is the Christian ideal for men, and the Christian revelation of Father and Son in God."

P. T. Forsyth, *Christ on Parnassus* (p. 213).

"No one can speak long in impassioned or rhetorical style about any society whatever without introducing metaphors drawn from architecture. The Christian writers fell immediately into the practice, and in so doing followed the example of Christ who said, 'Upon this rock will I *build* my church.' In this style of language, then, as the Church is a building, so each member of it is a stone, and the prosperity of the Church is expressed by the orderly arrangement and secure cementing of the stones. In other worlds, it is *building*. This then was the name which the Christians adopted. 'Let everything be done,' said St. Paul, 'with a view to edifying.'"

Sir John Seeley, *Ecce Homo* (ch. xix.).

xiv. 31. *Ye may all prophesy one by one.*

"I remember my predecessor at Oxford, Professor Bywater, telling me how, when he and his friends were students, they had two great prophets, 'John' and 'Thomas.' On every important question the thing was first to find out what John said and what Thomas said. (John's surname, as you may have guessed, was Ruskin, and Thomas's, Carlyle.) My own generation at College thought little of John, and detested Thomas. But the demand for prophets has continued and increased."

Professor Gilbert Murray, *Essays and Addresses* (p. 138).

xiv. 33. *God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.*

"In men who have risen to wide-reaching power we generally observe an early preponderance of one of two instincts—the instinct of rule and order, or the instinct of sympathy. The one instinct may degenerate into bureaucracy, the other into sentimentalism. Rightly ordered, they make the master or the leader of men." F. W. H. Myers, *Modern Essays* (p. 21).

xiv. 35. *Let them ask their husbands at home.*

"Those who care to speak about what is dearest to them are very rare, and most persons find conversation easy in proportion to the remoteness of its topics from them."

W. Hale White, *Clara Hopgood* (ch. xix.).

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

WORKS AND FRUIT (Gal. v. 19–22).

If a contrast is to be drawn between the world of the flesh and that of the spirit, two methods are possible. A realistic appeal can be made by setting alongside the characteristic products of the two worlds—the method of the parallel column—or the contrast may be drawn between the methods which are normal in the production of such results. While the parallel column has an immediate effect because of its appeal to the eye the latter method is needed to make the impression a reasoned and permanent conviction. The issue here is so important that Paul employs both methods, indicating an essential distinction between flesh and spirit not only in actual result but in method also. As the parallel lists stand in this chapter,

Flesh	Spirit
fornication	love
uncleanness	joy, &c.,

it appears that the contrast is drawn in colours sufficiently emphatic, but when this more subtle differentia indicated by the use of the words *ἔργα* and *καρπος* is introduced, we feel that this is, after all, the more important contribution to our thought on this vital matter. To indicate a contrast in result is a somewhat easy task for an observer of human life, but to adopt the latter method carries us to the heart of the question at once. Is it true that in the world of the flesh the characteristic products are and ought to be called "works," while those of the world of the spirit ought to be called "fruits"?

It is not difficult to feel the appropriateness of this distinction in connexion with the general trend of this epistle. The spiritual man is on his defence, showing the inalienable liberty and privilege of the man in Christ. As a man of the spirit to whom Divine revelations have been made immediately he claims the right of free existence for himself and his gospel—points out the temporary place held by law as the *παιδαγωγος* and sees from the heights of freedom he has gained, that the life of the spirit is productive, and that after the simple fashion of nature. He has so consciously fought law, especially now that its aspect of thraldom

was being thrust into prominence, that he turns to the spiritual world with deep relief, and now falls back upon a word which carries no suggestion of hardness or strain, "fruit." While allowing for the heat of the moment, and the urgency of the conditions, it would not be fair to say that these explain the use of this contrast, for we seem to have here a real distinction.

Two questions arise at once.

(1) Why not *ἔργα του πνευματος*? Is there any essential unfitness of the word "works" in this connexion? However, the matter may finally be phrased, modern psychology tends to show the inadequacy of the word "work" to describe some of the deepest and most vital facts in personality. Thus, for example, we find Baudouin saying (*Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*, p. 190): "Auto-suggestion will not bear its full fruit unless it is formulated with a minimum of effort. Here we have the chief discovery of the Nancy school. . . . Proportionally to its results this subconscious labour seems to induce much less fatigue than the work which is the outcome of conscious effort. . . . The suggested act surges up from the depths of our being, whereas the voluntary act emanates from the superficial strata of consciousness." At its best the word "work" would scarcely convey the idea of inevitable union. Here is the worker and there is the work. And it is equally clear that it is precisely this idea of inevitable union which is vital in Paul's conception of the relation between the soul and its Lord, "in Christ" being the characteristic expression of the most intimate fellowship. On this matter Paul is Johannine and John is Pauline, because each has seen the springing up of a new humanity in Christ. If *ἔργα* even at its best would be an unhappy and misleading word, how much more clearly this stands out when we remember how easily other associations gather around the word. The work may reproduce little of the master's spirit—it may be merely ingenious and bizarre. A work may conceivably be aloof from the worker, but a fruit is always a part of the tree's inner life.

Take Paul's list and see the impossibility of using a term of art instead of a word of natural life. What work could ever create love? In that emotional world, immediately the sense of strain becomes normal, the presence of effort is symptomatic of the fact that love has already either gone or is in serious

peril, and self-pity is beginning to take possession. What is true of love is true with equal force of the others. If they were simply *ἔργα* their spiritual essence would have disappeared in a moment. The temper which tries to labour after these has missed the way to their discovery.

(2) Why not *καρπος του σαρκος*?

There is nothing in the list of products here enumerated which cannot be described in terms of the world of mechanism. As the situation Paul has in mind is one of dissension, we are not surprised to find that of the fifteen, seven are deliberately anti-social, enmities, strife, &c. Anyone who has read any modern political history, would agree that these things are still seriously worked at. A man is not cynical who finds a curiously modern touch in Jeremiah's words, "They have taught their tongue to speak lies: they weary themselves to commit iniquity." It is one of the pathetic facts in human life that so much continued and tiring activity should go to the keeping alive of these horrors of society. We summon up in our minds the various arguments a perverted reason can produce, we hold a periodical review of them lest we should forget them, and we keep the anti-social idea alive by sheer hard work.

Is it not an essential part of our Christian witness to maintain that the higher naturalism is that of the spirit and that the norm for man is the man "in Christ." Whatever pertains to the lower realm of the flesh can never have the grace and ease which are normal in the realm of the spirit: "my yoke is easy and my burden is light." In the way of the spirit the Galatians would have brought forth the fruits of joy and peace but they slipped back to the lower level of the flesh and were torn with dissension and unrest. A good deal of modern study has been of man from below—the biologist has had a great innings—but when we once more study man from above we shall see that Paul was indicating a deep distinction and was pointing the way forward for a harassed humanity. R. Strong.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "It is my custom once a year to preach a sermon upon kindness to animals, and I should be glad if you would suggest a fresh text for a discourse upon this subject. I may say that

I have made use of the last words in the Book of Jonah." (C. T. D., New York.)

How would 2 Samuel xii. 3 do? You may remember that Cowper, who loved hares and birds, once used used this reference for the purpose you mention. The passage occurs in a letter to the Rev. Mr. Hurdis (June 13, 1791). "All the notice that we lords of creation vouchsafe to bestow on the creatures, is generally to abuse them; it is well, therefore, that here and there a man should be found a little womanish, or, perhaps, a little childish in this matter, who will make some amends, by kissing, coaxing, and laying them in one's bosom. You remember the little ewe lamb, mentioned by the prophet Nathan; the prophet perhaps invented the tale for the sake of its application to David's conscience; but it is more probable that God inspired him with it for that purpose. If He did, it amounts to a proof that He does not overlook, but, on the contrary, much notices such little partialities and kindness to His *dumb* creatures, as we, who are articulate, are pleased to call them."

(*b*) "I observe that you are not above furnishing ministers sometimes with illustrations from literature, to enliven their expositions of Holy Scripture, and this emboldens me to ask from you something that will bring home to my congregation the purport of Isaiah xlviii. 18: 'O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river.' Possibly some great author has written a word applicable to this text." (W. M., Glasgow.)

There is an echo of it in Matthew Arnold's *Letters* (vol. ii, p. 226). "The world is always thinking that the 'peace as a river' is to be had without having 'hearkened to the commandments,' but the prophet knows better." I am sorry that this is all I can supply at present.

(*c*) ". . . Another text with which I have some little difficulty is in Proverbs i. 17. You omit verse 16 in your translation, and then go on: 'It is in vain that birds behold the net spread for them.' Whereas our Bible reads thus: 'Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird.' I can understand our version but not yours." (B. J., Cardiff.)

The sixteenth verse was not in the original text; it does not occur in the text translated by the Septuagint, and probably was added by some one who thought that the first part of

Isaiah lix. 7 was applicable to the rascals here described. As for verse 17, it is not quite so clear as our English version suggests. It may mean (*a*) that it is useless to let a bird see you laying a snare for it; i.e. the writer seeks to put his pupil on his guard against the enticing appeals of the gang. Don't join them; you must surely see the danger that awaits you if you do. Or (*b*) it may mean that these rascals are like silly birds who do see the net and yet flutter into it. This is the sense that seems to me preferable:

> "It is in vain that birds behold
> the net spread for them;
> and these men trap themselves in death."

The point is that if you join them you will share the doom they bring upon themselves; they are blind to what awaits them, so bent are they on their evil courses. Though a bird sees the net, it flutters into it; so eager is the bird to get the tempting bait of food, that it shuts its eyes to everything else. And that is what such rapacious robbers do:

> "Such is the fate of gain ill-got,
> it ruins those who grasp it."

Thus the warning of verses 17–19 gives the reason for verse 15; it is an argument why the youth should not risk his life by joining an infatuated band of brigands.

The different senses are already indicated in the punctuation of our English versions. The Authorised Version, and the margin of the Revised, have no comma after "spread"; the Revised Version inserts a comma. Now, with the comma, the sense is that a net proves useless if the bird sees it; i.e. as in (*a*), the bird is not to be caught. Omit the comma, and you get (*b*), which yields really two possible meanings, as Professor A. B. Davidson pointed out in the EXPOSITOR (vol. vi, 1887): "either, It is vain to think to catch even birds, if you spread the net before their eyes: much more should you, my son, beware of a plain destruction lying before you; or, It is in vain that it is in their very sight that the net is spread, the foolish or greedy birds go into it nevertheless: and so these wicked men lay wait for their own blood, they go upon an enterprise which it may be seen will be their own destruction." I agree with Dr. Davidson that the last-named meaning is most

suitable to the context, and that in any case (*a*) is unlikely; "upon the whole, a bird's reflections are hardly to be expected here."

This may seem much ado about little, but does it not prove that a sentence in the Old Testament is not always so simple as it sounds? Even when you are content with the traditional text, its real meaning may not be what appears at first sight to be obvious. However, to console you in your homiletic plight, I present you with this allusion in R. L. Stevenson's *Catriona*. He makes his hero reflect: "'In vain is the net spread in the sight of any fowl,' the Scripture says. Well, fowls must be wiser than folk! For I thought I perceived the policy, and yet fell in with it."

(*d*) Psalm xlviii. 14: *For this God is our God for ever and ever, he will be our guide even unto death.*

. "This has always been a difficult verse; Delitzsch has suggested that the text is deficient, and nearly all other commentators have followed his lead, but this subterfuge is not necessary, it is our own shortsightedness that is to blame. Turning back to verse 12 we find that the subject under discussion is Zion ('Walk about Zion'), and in the next verse we are to 'tell the generation following' of her strength, 'for this God is our God for ever and ever, he will be our guide over (or, against) death,' i.e. the death of the fame of Zion. It is not with the death of us poor mortals that the Psalmist is concerned but with Zion, her towers, her bulwarks, and her palaces. And this Zion can or ought to be found just as much in England as in Palestine." (E. Hunt, Felixstowe.)

(*e*) ". . . May I venture to ask why you have left out some passages of Holy Writ from your translation of the Old Testament? I have not yet procured a copy of the second volume, but I read in the May number of the *Journal of Religion* that you have been guilty of this sin. Professor J. A. Bewer, of Union Theological Seminary in New York, one of our foremost scholars, in a review of your translation, writes thus: 'Professor Moffatt omits words, phrases, and even entire sentences and paragraphs without a single sign. One is now and then at a loss to find a reason for it. Has Jeremiah xxxi. 15–17 dropped out by a printer's carelessness? It does not look so, but why should it be omitted? Every scholar regards this exquisite

passage (beginning with "Thus saith Jehovah: A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping") as one of the certainly genuine sections of Jeremiah. Isaiah x. 20–23 also is left out; it is by no means so valuable, and it may not be originally Isaian, but if so, why is there no hint that it is a later addition?' Let me ask you if you have anything to say to this well-deserved reproof. Can there be any justification for a mutilated Bible?" (W. W. C., Chicago, U.S.A.)

Will reviewers never learn to read a book before they criticize it? Your strictures are well deserved, but I do not happen to deserve them. It is the fault of Dr. Bewer for having misled you. He asks if Jeremiah xxxi. 15–17 has dropped out by a printer's carelessness. No, the carelessness has been on the part of the reviewer, who has read so hastily that he has failed to notice that the passage in question is printed in its original position, between xl. 1 and xl. 2. So with Isaiah x. 20–23. It is restored to its original position between xxviii. 22 and xxviii. 23. These transpositions are quite familiar to any scholar who has worked upon the text of the prophets, and I cannot understand how Dr. Bewer has been so inaccurate. However, if you desire to blame anyone, pray in all equity do not blame me for uncommitted crimes.

REVIEWS.

Figures of the Passion of our Lord. Translated from the Spanish of Gabriel Miró by C. J. Hogarth. London: Guy Chapman, 1925. Pp. 255. Price 12*s.* 6*d.*

The word "figures" is misleading. This book contains not pen-and-ink sketches of the Crucifixion, but a series of imaginative descriptions which cover the story of our Lord's Passion. The author has written fifteen highly dramatic and vivid pictures, beginning with the treachery of Judas and ending with a description of the woman of Samaria meeting two of the disciples on their way to Galilee after the Resurrection. Señor Miró has evidently set himself the task of making the Passion romantically real to modern readers. He writes prose that is quivering with emotional suggestion; even through a translation one can feel that. He has got up the archæology of his period and place,

but he has not allowed his learning to weigh down his imagination. Taste varies, however, and some readers may feel that the story is brocaded too stiffly; one sometimes longs for a greater simplicity, such as Anatole France would have chosen. Not that Señor Miró cannot be simple when he pleases. Take, for example, his description of Pilate sentencing Jesus to death. "Swiftly gathering together his train, he descended the steps with his face now confronting Jesus, and said to the lictor Proximus, '*i, lictor: expedi crucem.*' Then slowly he departed. From pavements, walls, and battlements a hot vapour was arising, and cupolas and awnings all seemed to be looking down upon him with an invitation to silence and the repose of a siesta. Against purple cushions he could see outlined Claudia's white figure. But he entered the shady inner hall. There he found his guests asleep upon the great couches of the chamber. He unclasped his toga, and cast it down between the bronze wolf's paws. Cœlius awoke, and said with a smile: 'Ah, remorseless Procurator, then a single cross can depress thy spirit? How gentle that spirit must be!' Pontius paused. 'I am gentle,' he said, 'in so far as that this day I have not raised a cross upon every dwelling in Jerusalem.'"

The *format* of the book is remarkably handsome. The paper and print are most artistic.

* * * * *

Die Evangelienzitate des heiligen Irenæus, nach Ueberlief. erung und Textart untersucht. By Dr. Benedikt Kraft. Biblische Studien xxi. 4: Herder & Co., Freiburg im Breisgau. 1924. Pp. xvi, 116.

Dr. Kraft had finished his monograph when the English work by Sanday, Turner, and Souter appeared, but he has taken advantage of the latter to bring his study up to date. It may be described as an independent investigation, which offers some sharp criticisms of the English scholars, e.g. for undervaluing the evidence of the Armenian version and the Jena papyrus. He is disposed to place the Latin version earlier than most recent critics; instead of the fourth century, he conjectures that c. A.D. 300 may have been its date. This agrees with the opinion of Professor Turner. Dr. Kraft also gives reason for doubting the hypothesis that Irenæus was indebted to the Diatessaron. His own theory is that the Greek text used by

Irenæus had been already influenced by some Diatessaron. If we ask what the Greek text was, we are told that it came from Rome, which Irenæus venerated as the church best qualified to preserve the true Word. By the middle of the second century the Diatessaron of Tatian had been already rendered into Greek and was used at Rome, so that there is nothing to prevent the formation of such a text as that employed by Irenæus in Southern Gaul. Dr. Kraft does not notice Professor Burkitt's recent scepticism about a Greek version of the Diatessaron at Rome.

The pages of Dr. Kraft's thesis are crowded with details and with criticisms of other scholars. He has put his case sharply, but it is doubtful whether much is gained by denying that Irenæus used the Diatessaron. Definite proof can hardly be secured for either a denial or for an affirmation. Yet the probabilities lie on the side of the affirmation. At least, Dr. Kraft's arguments to the contrary do not sound decisive. As for the Diatessaron, it really seems to matter little whether Irenæus used it himself or whether it had merely been used already in the text before him.

* * * * *

Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit. By Bror Olsson. Inaugural Dissertation. Uppsala, 1925. Pp. xii, 238.

A carefully edited selection of eighty letters, dated between 30 B.C. and A.D. 110. The Greek text is printed with notes and translated; there are ample indices, and the introductions set each letter in its proper light. The author has had in mind not only the student of linguistic phenomena but those who are interested in wider spheres, and he has produced a scholarly handbook which has many attractive features. The letters, as he admits, do not possess very much historical interest, for their writers were peasants, workmen, and soldiers, for the most part, people who had not much time for discussing affairs of the State. There are no lairds of Cockpen among the writers of these scraps. On the other hand, they give often a vivid picture of the actual private life in families and small communities. Two specimens of *συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί* (2 Cor. iii. 1) are included, from A.D. 16. The second of these contains a phrase, *ἐν οἷς ἐάν σοι προσέρχηται*, which shows how *πρόσερχεσθαι* with the dative could denote "approach with a petition or

prayer," as in Hebrews xi. 6 (*πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἔστιν*). Another note, written in A.D. 39 by an Egyptian called Serapion, indicates an outburst of anti-Semitism at Alexandria, but this has been already edited by Professor Milligan for English readers. The editor notes, by the way (p. 104), that the phrase *γινώσκειν σε θέλω* only begins to appear about the beginning of the Christian era; till then the simpler imperative *γίνωσκε* prevailed. He also notes, in a letter of A.D. 70–80, the phrase, *τοῦ δέ σε μὴι εὑρεθῆναι*, where the genitive is the same as in ℵ* on 2 Corinthians ii. 13 (*τοῦ μὴ εὑρεῖν*); evidently the dative case was not uniform in this connexion. A note of A.D. 110, written by a man called Gemellus, has at the close, *ἀσπάζου τοὺς φιλοῦντές σε πάντες πρὸς ἀληθίαν*. "So far as I know," Professor Olsson observes, "this is the earliest example in the papyri of this beautiful greeting." It recurs in Titus iii. 15 *ἄσπασαι τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει*. The pleonasm in Apoc. ii. 7, 17 (*τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ*) seems to have been fairly common in ordinary usage; Professor Olsson cites a contemporary (p. 207) example from an Egyptian letter—*Λάμπωνι μυσθηρευτῇ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ*.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

In a foreword to *British Preachers* (G. P. Putnam's, 6*s.* net) we are told that this is "the first of an annual volume of sermons which it is proposed to publish." It contains twenty-one sermons; Miss Maude Royden is the only woman among the preachers, and the men include Dean Inge, Dr. L. P. Jacks, Dr. Norman Maclean, and Dr. John A. Hutton. To criticize a collection like this is almost impossible; all that a reviewer can say is that the level is wonderfully high, and that, while no one sermon is remarkable, hardly any are below the standard set by the better discourses in the volume. They are not arranged in any order, neither according to the Christian year nor according to the alphabetical names of their writers. But this adds to the unexpectedness of perusal. It is possible to read two or three at a sitting, and yet possess the sense of variety.

* * * * *

We welcome a third edition of Dr. Archibald Chisholm's

monograph upon *Labour's Magna Charta* (Longmans, Green and Co., 3*s.* 6*d.*), which has now taken its place as a standard treatise upon the moral and economic programme of Labour. In a fresh preface, Dr. Chisholm calls attention to the progress that has been made in international Labour legislation. As he observes, "if there is to be social advance in Europe, it must be accompanied by a corresponding advance in industrial conditions among the backward peoples," and he gives instances of this advance in the East. The high tone and the accurate investigations of this book are known to most people who are interested in the subject; it is gratifying to find that there is a steady sale for it among the thoughtful public.

* * * * *

Rabbi H. G. Enelow has reprinted a pamphlet on *The Theoretical Foundation of Reform Judaism* (from *The Jewish Yearbook*, xxxiv), a vigorous defence and exposition of its principles. Reform Judaism, he claims, "regards Judaism as mobile, subject to change and adaptation, correlated with the diverse conditions of successive ages," and akin to the best phases of Pharisaism. He insists on its stress upon the ethical, and on its universal appeal, since it goes back to the religious teaching of the prophets of Israel, especially to the Second Isaiah.

* * * * *

Mr. E. G. Boulenger's *Queer Fish* (London: Partridge, 3*s.* 6*d.*) is not a description of some theologians or of certain religious sects. It is a popular, illustrated book about real fish, by the director of the Zoological Society's Aquarium, about fish that shoot, for example, about fighting fish, about perch that climb trees, and so forth. The queer things are not confined to fish, however; sometimes fishermen act queerly. Thus Mr. Boulenger tells how "on the coast of Portugal there is a regular fishery for crab claws alone. There the claws are torn off the unfortunate crabs, who are thrown back into the sea to grow fresh ones"!

* * * * *

The Rev. Selby Jefferson, of Lambeth, Ontario, has written a small expository and devotional study of the Lord's Supper, called *Our Passover* (G. H. Stockwell, 3*s.* 6*d.*). He first of all prints in order the relevant passages, arranging them chronologically. Then follows the interpretation. It falls into four parts. Mr. Jefferson sees An Enjoined Memory, A Specific

Proclamation (i.e. 1 Cor. xi. 26), A New Covenant, and a Unique Communion. It is a welcome indication of the spirit which inspires the United Church of Canada that so irenic and brotherly a volume should be published upon a question which has been responsible for much division and bitterness among Christians. Mr. Jefferson is bent upon emphasizing the common possession of the Church, not upon giving any sharp definition of terms. He does hold that our Lord's words about "shed for many for the remission of sins" imply a death which may be called substitutionary. "Certainly we have confused many minds, and, maybe, broken many a heart by pressing personally preferred theories of Atonement when we should have been glorying only in the fact of that Atonement"; yet, he adds, "Let us hold hard the simple, ungainsayable fact that here in these records is set forth what is in *some* way a substitutionary death, the death of One for many."

* * * * *

Education in East Africa (London: Edinburgh House Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*) is the report of an American Commission which was specially interested in the education of negroes, when it visited East Africa in 1924. The survey covers Kenya Colony, Uganda, Bechuanaland, etc.; it is admirably arranged and well illustrated. Though the Commission was initiated by American philanthropists, it included British citizens and one native African, and it was helped in every way by the Governors and Colonial Secretaries. The report claims that Americans are closely connected with the development of Africa, owing to the experience of the United States in handling their negro population, but there is little in these pages that is tinged with a provincial superiority, and several frank expressions occur of admiration for the British government. Reports of this kind tend to become vague, too full of kind generalizations or of hasty advice. But there is much to be learned from the well-stocked pages of this volume. It even includes a long technical chapter upon agriculture, written by an expert.

* * * * *

Professor G. Abbott-Smith has issued a small pamphlet of *Corrections and Additions* (T. and T. Clark, 6*d.*) to his excellent "Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament," which is now in its second edition.

CURRENT ISSUES.

ONCE it was possible to ignore eschatology. When Harnack wrote his fascinating book, *What is Christianity?* he was able to expound the gospel without troubling to deal with the eschatology. Then came Schweitzer, and there seemed to be more eschatology than gospel in the New Testament. A school arose which shifted eschatology from the circumference to the centre. And, since then, it has been at least admitted that eschatology is an integral part of original Christianity.

* * * * *

But this does not make the modern man like it any better. He does not care to believe that Jesus suffered from an illusion, and he cannot bring himself to expect any sudden, immediate coming of the Kingdom. It is to this problem that Professor C. R. Bowen addressed himself, when he spoke as president to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Chicago, last December. His address is now printed in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, under the title "Why Eschatology?" He believes that we need eschatology, a genuine eschatology, and he gives us his reasons.

* * * * *

One is, that we must have an explanation of the world in relation to God. Let us define Eschatology. It is "the undefeatable conviction that in the end God, and not the devil, shall rule, that all the age-long course of sin and shame shall end in purity and peace, that what creation made implicit shall become explicit, that the universe is at heart good, and from it evil as a foreign intruder shall be ultimately expelled." Christianity, as a historical religion, cannot dispense with this. It reiterates faith in the destiny of man.

* * * * *

But what of the New Testament hope of an immediate end? Well, it was a vivid foreshortening of the time-process; it was

an error in perspective. History has proved that. But, Professor Bowen argues, this was merely an intense way of affirming the reality of the hope. If Jesus and the disciples believed that the Day of the Lord was at hand, they were interested not in chronology but in God's timeless purpose.

* * * * *

Besides, such assurance of faith hastens the time. "How swiftly did the human spirit in those illumined years of the first century make progress towards its goal, leaping where we crawl!" Men felt then the divine purpose pressing upon their hearts. It was this, and no mechanical study of Daniel's prophecies, which gave them their glowing faith and insight. And, Professor Bowen urges, what we to-day need is not any preoccupation with simply apocalyptic categories but a keen vision of the divine end and purpose.

* * * * *

What is the Glory of God? The manifestation of His presence and purpose, the honour and purity of His being. Dr. Abrahams, in a recent book of lectures on *The Glory of God*, stresses the truth that this divine Glory is most clearly revealed in His moral excellence, and consequently that a response is expected from His people. The primitive idea was that God's glory was most vividly shown in a storm, as a power working through lightning, thunder, rain, and hail. The Hebrews saw a massive manifestation of the Deity in such phenonema. As Dr. Abrahams observes, "the storm is nowhere else described in ancient poetry as it is in Hebrew." But as God's power working for righteousness, the Glory became associated afterwards with less dramatic and external phenomena; it was verified in human life. And God's people were expected to honour Him by reproducing the same moral excellence.

* * * * *

There is a verse in the book of Proverbs which brings out this truth. "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker: but he that hath mercy on the needy honoureth Him." Why? Because, as Dr. Abrahams observes, "Man's oppression denies the perfection of the world, man's mercy asserts that perfection." When one is kind, one is bringing out the Divine quality of kindness and love, illustrating it, as we might say.

Hence to act for God's Glory is to act from unselfish motives. To glorify God is the opposite of self-glorification. And Dr. Abrahams points out that the temptation to glorify oneself is never far from the very churches or parties which claim most loudly to be aching for the glory of God Himself. "All sects are inclined to take God's name in vain, presuming and boasting to be working for His glory when they are scheming for their own. 'In hoc signo' may camouflage a worldly ambition."

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

B. The second main position of the regnant hypothesis.
  i. What do we mean by 'Deuteronomy'?
  ii. Its distinctive style and phraseology.
  iii. Its date. Four theories.

I. Mosaic authorship in all essentials. Orr, etc.
  Two specimen difficulties.
    i. Nu. 26–36 compared with Deuteronomy.
    ii. The Code itself—its lack of order, its actual laws.

II. Deuteronomy in the main is Josiah's Book of the Covenant. De Wette, etc.
    i. Based on early laws, but compiled between 700 and 621 B.C.
    ii. Demands centralisation. *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom.*

III. Deuteronomy belongs to the exilic or early post-exilic period.
  1. Hölscher.
    i. Centralisation impracticable under Josiah.
    ii. Was it impracticable? Size of Josiah's kingdom.
  2. Kennett.
    i. The book the result of a religious unification of Judah and Samaria during the captivity.
    ii. Criticism of a specimen point—'all Israel.'
    iii. Relation of Jeremiah to Deuteronomy.

IV. Deuteronomic Law belongs to the early monarchy, but with later additions—Welch.
  1. Early character of the legislation. Aim not centralisation.
  2. Three difficulties.
    i. The phrase 'the place which Yahweh shall choose.'
    ii. Chap. 12^{1-7}.
    iii. 2 Kings 22–23.

3. Two illustrations.
   i. Law of Passover.
   ii. Stones and altar on Mt. Ebal.

Conclusion. The second main position, with minor modifications, still stands.

Article 4. Deuteronomy.

In the preceding Articles we have followed Prof. Welch's lead (Expositor, May, 1923) and concentrated our attention on the literary analysis of the Pentateuch, with special reference to Gen. 1^1–Ex. 6^2. We left on one side the collateral question as to the dates of the three documents, J, E and P. If we are still to follow the same lead, we must now to some extent reverse this procedure and, in regard to Deuteronomy, give large attention to the question of the date of publication. According to Welch, "the second main position of 'the regnant hypothesis' is that the book of Deuteronomy, if not in its present, at least in its original, form, was first brought to light in 621 under King Josiah, when it was used as the basis for an effort at reform in the national religion. As such, it marked a new departure in the religious life of Judah, especially in connection with the concentration of worship at the Temple at Jerusalem. Certain of its main contentions were therefore wholly novel in the Kingdom." This position, Welch says, has been "seriously shaken." Exception must be taken to the last sentence of this statement.* I have, however, at this stage only one criticism to make, but it is a far-reaching one, viz. that this statement singles out the question of the date of publication and treats that as though it were the main issue, whereas the really fundamental position is that Deuteronomy stands, so to speak, midway between JE and P. This position has been arrived at as the result of a laborious comparison of D with JE and P in respect of (*a*) narratives and (*b*) laws and is untouched

* See Driver on Deut., p. lvi.

by any of the attempts which have been made of late to cast doubt upon the exact nature of the relation of Deuteronomy to the Reform under Josiah.

How intricate is the problem raised by Deuteronomy may be seen in the fact that intelligent men have put forward the most diverse solutions. The book has been regarded as belonging to the time of (1) Moses, (2) the early Kings, (3) King Josiah, (4) the Exile or after. Only by setting aside presuppositions, distinguishing what we have good evidence for from speculative inferences, and seeking to do justice to all the data, can we hope to arrive at a true solution. In this spirit let us take up the study of Deuteronomy once more and see how far the different theories explain the phenomena we find therein.

At the outset let us clear our minds as to what we mean by Deuteronomy. The only legitimate meaning is the whole book as we now have it. The moment that we accept this we are faced by the fact that there are portions of the book, which on all hands are recognized as late. Prof. Orr writes in the interests of Mosaic authorship, but he says : " It is not disputed that, in the form in which we have it, the book shows signs of editorial redaction. The discourses are put together with introductory and connecting notes (which however differ little in style from the rest of the work) and the last part of the work with its account of Moses' death and in one or two places what seem unmistakable indications of JE and P hands (in chapters 31, 32 and 34) point clearly to such redaction." * If Orr had remembered that " Deuteronomy " meant the whole book would he have characterized as " remarkable " and " paradoxical " Dr. Driver's statement that " Deuteronomy does not claim to have been written by Moses " ? The man who writes consistently about Moses in the third

* *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 251.

person * is the man who alone can be called 'the author.' The material he uses may or may not be Mosaic, but the book itself (apart from small P additions) is by him and not by Moses. Moreover, if it proves to be true that the Priestly document is post-exilic, then "unmistakable indications of the Priestly hand" bring Deuteronomy, as we now have it, down to a date later than the Exile.

Not only is Deuteronomy, as we now have it, admittedly late, but its style and phraseology are generally recognized as marking it off from the rest of the Pentateuch. "There are," writes Orr, "marked differences between the Deuteronomic and the JE and P styles.† He quotes with approval Driver's remark that "particular words and phrases recur with extraordinary frequency, giving a distinctive colouring to every part of the work."‡ The fact that this "distinctive colouring" runs through practically the whole book points to the conclusion that the speeches, as well as the narratives, are the composition of the author (or authors). This would be in accordance with the literary usage of the Hebrew historians.§ Orr does not agree with this inference, but he says justly: "the composition of a book of exhortation or instruction in the form of addresses by Moses—provided this is only a literary dress—is not *a priori* to be ruled out as inadmissible or incompatible with just views of Scripture." ‖ It is when we come to the question of the dates of compilation and 'publication' that we find acute controversy raging to-day.

* See 1^{5}, 4^{41-49}, 5^{1}, $27^{1,9,11}$, $29^{1,2}$, 31^{1-30}. † Orr, *Problem*, p. 253.

‡ Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. lxxvii. and see list of seventy of the more noticeable words or phrases, pp. lxxviii.–lxxxiv. Note also Orr, as quoted above, the "introductory and connecting notes . . . differ little in style from the rest of the work."

§ See Driver, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 90.

‖ *The Problem*, p. 249. He adds a footnote: "Ecclesiastes, e.g., put into the mouth of Solomon, is generally admitted, even by conservative critics, to be a work of this kind."

The competitive theories are four in number.

I. There are those who still stand valiantly for the Mosaic authorship in all essential respects, whilst admitting that there has been subsequent editorial revision and annotation.* In the short space available, the utmost I can do is to set forth just two points as specimens of the phenomena which to my mind rule out the hypothesis that Moses wrote the addresses and laws practically as we now have them.

i. Numb. 26–36 professes to give us judgments and instructions delivered by Moses in the plains of Moab in the fortieth year after the Exodus in and after the sixth month.† Deut. professes to give us "the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan . . . in the fortieth year in the eleventh month . . . in the land of Moab" (1^{1-5}). When we compare these two groups of discourses, professedly delivered by the same man within six months of one another, we cannot fail to be struck by the extraordinary difference in vocabulary,‡ in outlook and situation § and in legislation.‖ It seems impossible to accept the view that both come from the same man.

ii. This by itself does not necessarily prove that Deuteronomy is not Mosaic in its main contents, because it may be Numbers which is the later document (as in fact "the

* See, e.g., James Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament* (Nisbet, 1905); a smaller book on Deuteronomy alone by J. S. Griffiths, *The Problem of Deuteronomy* (S.P.C.K., 1911); H. M. Wiener, *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy* (Elliot Stock, 1920, reprinted from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*); etc.

† See Nu.$1^{20\text{-}1, 22}$ with 33^{36-38}, 22^{1}, $26^{3, 63}$, 33^{50}, 36^{13}.

‡ E.g., 'congregation,' măṭṭĕh (tribe), and 'princes of the congregation' (prince 61 times in the Hebrew) in Numbers become in Deuteronomy 'assembly,' shēvĕt (tribe), 'heads' (of tribes) and 'elders.'

§ E.g., the position of Levites (Nu. 35^{1-8}, Deut. $12^{12, 18-19}$, $18^{1-2, 6}$) and Priests (Ex. 28–30, Nu. 3 and 8, and Deut. 18^{1-8}); cp. the story of the Spies (Deut. 1^{22-46}, agreeing with JE and not with P in Nu. 13).

‖ E.g., the cities of refuge (Nu. 35^{9-34}, Deut. 19^{1-13}), etc.

regnant hypothesis" believes it to be), but if now we examine the Deuteronomic code itself (chaps. 12–26), we find it very different from what we should expect, if it were a code drawn up in advance by Moses in anticipation of their entrance into the promised land. (*a*) It shews few traces of any attempt to treat subjects for legislation in any intelligible order. This is the portion of the book which Welch has examined afresh in *The Code of Deuteronomy*, and we may cordially accept his demonstration of the heterogeneous assortment of much of the material.* (*b*) Many of its regulations seem clearly to deal with problems which could only have arisen after settlement in the land.† If we had received this code or compilation of laws by itself and had to decide its nature from internal evidence, I believe that we should come unanimously to the conclusion that it was not the original work of a single mind and elaborated at one time, but rather a compilation of laws due originally to various minds, dealing with the various heterogeneous problems which cropped up through a considerable period of time.‡

II. From the time of De Wette onwards scholars have with general agreement identified the original form of Deuteronomy with "the book of the law" found by Hilkiah in the house of the LORD in the days of King Josiah. "There is no reason to doubt," wrote Orr, "that the book which called forth this reformation embraced, if it did not entirely consist of, the Book of Deuteronomy.§ Undoubtedly the writer of 2 Kings 22–23 regards Deuter-

* *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 12, 23, 136, 185 ('The code has no order'), 189.

† E.g., how to deal with a dead body discovered in open country (Deut. 21^{1-9}, see *Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 144).

‡ For fuller discussion, see, e.g., A. H. McNeile, *Deuteronomy, its Place in Revelation* (Longman, 1912), and D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism*, Chap. V (2nd Edition, Oxf. Univ. Press, 1924).

§ *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 257.

onomy (in whole or in part) as the book which was read before Josiah. A long list of parallels can be drawn up, shewing the close connection between the two.*

Based upon this identification with "the book of the law" and upon the internal evidence of the Book itself, the regnant hypothesis has taught that the *compiling* of the regulations in Deut. 12–26 probably took place at some time in the reign of Manasseh, Amon or Josiah. Dr. Welch writes as if the fact "that the book of Deuteronomy as a whole has a history, and that inside the book the groups of laws, even the individual laws, have a history," were a novel idea only now coming to light. "The application of this fact," he says, "*will* have a far-reaching influence on the attitude which must be taken up to the reform under Josiah." † But this fact has been a commonplace of criticism for many years. "Criticism," wrote Bishop Ryle in 1898, "has clearly revealed and strenuously reiterated that Dt. contains and expounds laws of very much greater antiquity than its own compilation." ‡ Twenty-five years ago Carpenter and Harford put it thus. After speaking (1) of the "pervading unity of thought and style," they said: "(2) the unity thus implied includes beneath it great diversity both of contents and expression . . . (3) the probability that the Deuteronomic legislation contains elements from various sources is increased by the evidence of the co-existence of different forms of the same law side by side, and the occasional blending of separate regulations into one. . . . It is probably to the derivation of the laws from various shorter collections that the occasional separation of precepts on related subjects is to be ascribed."

* For such a list see Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. xlv.

† Article in Expositor, May, 1923, p. 356. The use of italics is mine, not Prof. Welch's.

‡ Article on Deuteronomy in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i, p. 603.

Finally under (4) the authors shew that among the "different sources" must be reckoned "the collections of both Judah and Ephraim" (for "many laws are plainly related to regulations in JE and P^h"), "very ancient usage and custom" and "some corpus of priestly law." * Driver expressed similar views.†

Welch has admirably brought out the antiquity of many laws, such as "the expiation of undiscovered murder," but in so doing he has merely dotted the 'i's' and crossed the 't's' of previous scholars. And these same scholars have long ago pointed out the legitimate applications of these facts. They would cordially accept as their own almost every word of Welch's statement in his EXPOSITOR Article (p. 357): "Deuteronomy only gathered into one code and submitted to one aim what had slowly been forming itself in Israel as the true way of worshipping Yahweh and of living under His control. . . . Much of what took place under Josiah may have been the selection and arrangement of the best law in the past and its issue under the authority of the national leaders." The only difference between Welch, as he now stands, and the men whom he criticizes is as to the nature of the "one aim" and how it was proposed that it should be carried out. Let us see what the difference is. The view of the exponents of the regnant hypothesis could not be better expressed than by Welch in his earlier book, *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*. "Deuteronomy insists upon two special reforms . . . really corollaries from its fundamental principle and the means of making this dominate the actual life of the people. The first was the *nationalisation* of worship; the

* *Oxford Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 267–8. The whole note on Deut. 12^1 should be carefully read.

† *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 90 and 93 (6th Edition) and *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, pp. lvi.–lxii.

second was its *centralisation* at Jerusalem. What I mean by the nationalisation of the worship is that a deliberate effort was made to suppress the *local* sacrifices of clan and family and with this end in view it was determined that private sacrifices should only be permitted at the *central* sanctuary. But it does more than merely forbid. It provides the great Festivals . . . with motives taken from the history of Yahweh's dealings with His people. The people when they come together to worship their God are to come to a shrine which has associations with their national worship and with that alone." The aim of Deuteronomy was "a truly national worship"; the means was "the centralisation of the cult." This centralisation "was at first a piece of *practical* legislation."*

In *The Code of Deuteronomy* the second part of this position is abandoned, and abandoned by reason of the formulation of a new view of Deuteronomy as having been first compiled during the Exile.

III. The theory that Deuteronomy was compiled during the Exile has been championed by Prof. Hölscher of Marburg and Prof. Kennett of Cambridge, working on quite independent lines.

1. Prof. Hölscher published a long article in the *Z.A.W.*, 1921,† in which he set himself to prove that Deuteronomy was not the programme of the reform in 621 B.C., but its product. He argues that many of the laws—about the tithe, about the harvest-festivals, about the firstlings—lay down regulations which no man could obey, when Jerusalem was made the sole legitimate shrine. But sane men, face to face with the conditions of their own time, would not

* *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom* (T. & T. Clark, 1912), pp. 207–212. Certain words in the above quotations are italicized by me in order to bring out the points at issue.

† See also *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 16–18 and passim (see Index).

demand impossibilities. Therefore these laws are not the work of legislators in Josiah's time; they are the dreams of exilic priests, obsessed with the idea that centralization was the way to religious health for the nation. They never stopped to ask themselves whether these laws were practicable. The laws about the king and about war were equally impracticable.

Welch rejects the conclusion, but he accepts the premiss. Whereas in 1912 he spoke of centralisation as "a piece of practical legislation," he now bases his own theory about Deuteronomy upon the same conviction that the requirement that firstfruits and tithes must be brought to, and festivals and sacrifices kept at, Jerusalem was quite impracticable. But is this so? Take, for example, Welch's argument in connection with the Passover law in chap. 16^{1-8} that the regulation that the flesh of the Passover must be cooked and eaten in the evening and that at sunrise the worshippers must return home "must have made it peculiarly difficult and even impossible to observe, when the cult was centralised at Jerusalem." * Why 'impossible'? Because of the distance from their own homes? In the first place the difference was not great in Josiah's time. As Welch says: "In the period of Josiah Israel had practically become the city of Jerusalem with its dependent towns." † The great majority of the people probably lived within one, or at the outside two, days' journey from Jerusalem. In the second place, however far distant the home was, there could be no difficulty in sacrificing and eating on the appointed evening and turning homeward the next morning. The law doesn't say that

* *The Code*, pp. 66–67, and cp. p. 72.

† *The Code*, p. 147. Cp. Kennett (*Camb. Biblical Essays*, p. 103) in reference to the earlier reformation: "The law of the One Sanctuary had been possible in the very small kingdom which Sennacherib had left to Josiah's great-grandfather Hezekiah."

they must all reach home the day they started back. But if not, where is the difficulty ? Is it not purely imaginary. The same ignoring of the restricted area of the Southern Kingdom in Josiah's time leads Hölscher to declare it impossible for the entire household to come to Jerusalem for the feast of harvest. Akin to this is the same writer's argument that it was quite impracticable to legislate that the entire population (which he puts at 120,000) should come up to Jerusalem at one time. But Deuteronomy lays down no fixed dates for the Festivals and if, as Welch has well insisted we should do,* we avoid 'reading into the Deuteronomic laws' what is only laid down in later laws, the difficulty disappears. It is quite gratuitous to lay down that "centralisation . . . inevitably led to the appointment of one common date for the day." † It seems in fact only to require common sense to solve the various impracticabilities, which both Hölscher and Welch see in the laws, as soon as they are read as demanding attendance at Jerusalem.‡

2. Prof. Kennett for the last twenty years has put forward, in a succession of Articles,§ a similar theory as to the late date of Deuteronomy, but has based it on quite other grounds.

i. He objects, e.g., to a date in or before 621 B.C. on such grounds as (*a*) that this does not account for the fact that the Law of Holiness (Lev. 17) makes far less concession in respect of the slaying of animals for food than does Deut. 12, or for the fact that Jeremiah seventeen years after 621 B.C. declared that the Mosaic Law was not concerned with burnt-

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 77–82, 37, 61–4.

† *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 81. Surely here Welch transgresses his own dictum.

‡ See the 'Conclusion' of this Article.

§ Articles in *J.T.S.*, Jan., 1905, and July, 1906; and in *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, pp. 99–135; and *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1920).

offering and sacrifice ; and (*b*) that it does not provide any suitable occasion for the combination of North Israelite (E) and Judæan (J) legend and law. He suggests that the actual compilation of J may be traced to the reactionary prophetic party after the reformation of Josiah.

" Jeremiah's emphatic denial (7^{22}) that the law given to Israel at the Exodus was concerned with burnt-offering or sacrifice " would be " inexplicable, if J had been generally accepted as canonical for any length of time." In fact Kennett would understand " a lying pen of scribes had wrought falsely " (Jer. 8^{8}) as directed against J * with its stories of the patriarch's building altars in various places. A similar process was carried out by the priests of Bethel, ' a revised code of law being compiled with a body of traditions concerning the fathers of the race ' (E). After the carrying away of all the priests and Levites from Jerusalem (597–586 B.C.), probably Jerusalem and Bethel joined forces, the Aaronite priests from Bethel came to Jerusalem and the two documents J and E were combined into one. " But the document so ingeniously put together was nevertheless inadequate. It contained no explicit statement of the law of the One Sanctuary and indeed made reference to a plurality of altars." A new effort was therefore made " to provide a basis of reunion for all Israel," and the result was Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy was clearly intended to supersede JE and therefore must be distinctly later. It was probably completed before the rebuilding of the temple under Zerubbabel (520–515 B.C.). Chapters 1–11 are the production of disciples of Jeremiah, who effected a compromise between Jeremiah's denunciation of all sacrifice and the reformed sacrifices of the Deuteronomic party.

* Marti and others regard it as directed against Deuteronomy, but Skinner, as against both, points out that it is more probably directed, not against the law itself, but against scribal developments, which falsified the true inwardness of the law (*Prophecy and Religion*, pp. 103–5).

2 Kings 22–23 cannot in his opinion be quoted against him, because the author, if 23^{25-27} comes from his pen, wrote after the Captivity had begun, i.e. at least thirty-five years after the events of 621 B.C., probably much later, and therefore the details of his account may be based not upon actual personal knowledge or even upon actual documents, but upon a belief that Josiah must have acted upon Deuteronomic law. N.B.—If Deuteronomy was not completed until near the days of Zerubbabel, this brings 2 Kings down to at least one hundred years after Josiah.

ii. The argument is extremely ingenious and needs to be read as a whole to be fully appreciated. It consists of a large number of subtle inferences and assumptions and my feeling is that in many cases they rest upon very slender foundations. Take for example his initial argument in *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 4 and 5. "If," he says, "Deuteronomy was the book found in the Temple—assuming that a book of tôrā was actually found there—either it had just been written with a view to the existing situation, or it had been composed some time before, but events had made it impossible to put it into practice. Both these hypotheses are however excluded by what we know of the history of Judah and Israel; for, whereas Deuteronomy is clearly addressed to '*all* Israel' (1^1, etc.), Josiah had jurisdiction only over Judah, and neither he nor any other Judæan of his time could have legislated for Samaria. . . . A like difficulty precludes the alternative supposition that Deuteronomy was written at an earlier date . . . for . . . the circumstances of Hezekiah's reign were not favourable to legislation for *all* Israel." For the same reason Kennett goes on (pp. 5–7) to urge that "a mere enumeration of the outstanding features of the Deuteronomic law is sufficient to disprove the idea that it could have arisen in the days of Manasseh or Hezekiah or at an

earlier date." The argument here assumes that the Deuteronomic writer (or writers) was himself seeking to address, or legislate for, ' all Israel,' but it is surely obvious that, as he is professing to tell what Moses said to the assembled tribes in the plains of Moab, ' all Israel ' is appropriate to that situation and that therefore the phrase cannot be relied on as evidencing who were the body of people whom the Deuteronomist was aiming at reaching in his own day. He may reasonably be regarded as having in view the actual people who were then in close touch with Jerusalem.

iii. The relation of Jeremiah to Deuteronomy was regarded as clear twenty-five years ago. " Jeremiah," wrote Driver, " is the earliest prophet who can be demonstrated to have been acquainted with Deuteronomy." * But Kennett devotes six pages of one of his articles † to the consideration of this subject and claims that he has at least demonstrated the possibility that Deuteronomy draws many phrases from the prophet and not *vice versa*. Welch makes a similar effort in the opposite direction, trying to shew that Deuteronomy (esp. 26^{1-11}) may have preceded Hosea (chap. 2). ‡ It is impossible in this Article to go into the arguments. I must content myself with saying that I think that the verdict of most scholars will be that the true order is Hosea, Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (as contemporaries the one of the other in the prophet's earliest days), the earlier form of the Law of Holiness and Ezekiel, the Priestly Code. § The only way in which Hölscher can evade the argument for the priority of Deuteronomy to Ezekiel is by cutting down the genuine prophecies of

* *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. lxiii., and for specimen parallels and diversities see pp. xciii.–iv.

† "The Date of Deuteronomy," *J.T.S.*, July, 1906, pp. 481–6.

‡ *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 31–34, and cp. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. lxiii.

§ See Dr. Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion*, chap. 6, " Jeremiah and Deuteronomy."

Ezekiel to a minimum and assigning the mass of our Book to later pseudonymous writers.*

Prof. Kennett justifies the process by which he has reconstructed history by the analogy of the work of "the anatomist, who from a few scattered bones reconstructs a whole skeleton." We must however remember that, in order to bring about this reconstruction, he has had to pull to pieces a previous construction of the history by one who may have been living at the time and whom Dr. Skinner characterizes as "an honest, fair-minded and reliable historian." Kennett quotes 2 Kings 23^{23-25} as shewing that the writer must have been writing after the Fall of Jerusalem, but Skinner gives good reasons for thinking that this particular passage is due to a later Editor and that the principal writer wrote before that event.† By Kennett's magic wand "what was once considered a barren period of history in a wasted land" ‡ is made to "rejoice and blossom as the rose," but one has an uneasy feeling that it may be the magic of the conjuror rather than the vision of the sober historian, and that the Deuteronomic rose has been transplanted from an earlier period, when the Temple at Jerusalem was still in being.

IV. Prof. Welch, as we have seen, is not satisfied with any of the above hypotheses and he propounds another.

1. We have all been wrong, he says, in thinking that the Deuteronomic code demands centralisation. From the days of the Exile everyone has understood "the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose" as meaning one central sanctuary, but this was a mistake. The phrase really meant any local sanctuary which was a genuine shrine for the worship of Yahweh alone and had never had

* "Hesekiel der Dichter und das Buch," *Z.A.W.*, Beiheft 39. See account of Hölscher's article in Box's article in *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, July, 1925.

† *The Century Bible, 1 and 2 Kings*, pp. 18–23.

‡ *J.T.S.*, July, 1906, p. 500.

associations with Canaanite worship. Once grant this interpretation and the legislation becomes intelligible as the product of the religious revival under the earlier prophets from Samuel onwards.*

i. We cordially grant that Welch has admirably brought out the fact that much of the legislation reflects primitive and simple social and political conditions.† At the same time we need to bear in mind Dr. S. A. Cook's caveat that these simple conditions are not necessarily criteria of antiquity and may have reproduced themselves in Palestine in exilic and post-exilic times.‡

ii. We agree also with his proposition that, apart from the particular phrase in dispute, the main concern of many of the laws is "the distinctive, divinely authorised character of Israel's worship" and that this must be offered at Yahweh's altar in accordance with the rites which Yahweh has laid down. A very large proportion of Welch's book is devoted to the elucidation of these two points, and in this respect could not be bettered.

2. But from this point we must part company.

* *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 30–31, 197, etc.

† See, e.g., *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 25–29 on the law of the First-fruits in 26^{1-11}. In the EXPOSITOR article, pp. 353–5, Welch refers to this as "an archaic ritual about the harvest-thanksgiving which the legislators did not themselves follow." He says that it was "already so old and primitive as to have passed out of use in the period of Josiah. No one has ever suggested that the feast of harvest-thanksgiving, which was carried out under Josiah and which was so prominent a feature of the reform, followed the simple rubric, which is laid down in 26^{1-7}." It would be interesting to hear from Welch where we can read about this feast of harvest-thanksgiving in Josiah's reign. Was he thinking of Neh. 8^{13-17}? And how does he know that the ritual of Deut. 26^{1-7} had "already passed out of use" by 621 B.C.? This is only one of several curious slips, e.g., the citation (on p. 114 of *The Code of Deuteronomy*) of Amos 9^{7} as saying that Yahweh brought the *Canaanites* from Kir.

‡ S. A. Cook, "Some Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism," *J.T.S.*, Jan., 1925, pp. 156–173. Cp. Welch's own note (p. 154 of his book) on the conjunction of elders and judges in Deut. 21^{2} and Ezra 10^{14}, in which he says: "Was there a revival of primitive custom after the Exile . . . ?" Note also his own explanation on p. 188 of the absence of technical terms which he comments on in an earlier passage (p. 163).

i. We cannot accept Welch's view of the crucial phrase, describing the legitimate place of worship, which in one form or other occurs 21 times in Deut. 12–31.* This has for over two thousand years been regarded as clearly laying down the sole legitimacy of the central sanctuary. But, says Dr. Welch, "from the purely linguistic point of view the phrase is tolerant of the other interpretation, according to which the Israelites are commanded to confine their worship to sanctuaries which belong to their own faith." and, when so read, the command "loses at once all appearance of an impracticable dream." I must confess to grave doubts as to the legitimacy of construing the above-mentioned phrase, even in its simplest form, as meaning 'a place which Yahweh shall choose which is near your home, or which is within the borders of your own tribe.' No doubt in Hebrew the definite article is sometimes used where we should use the indefinite. I give some instances in a footnote,† but it will be noted that in all these cases the noun is not otherwise defined, whereas in the phrase "the place which the LORD (thy God) shall choose . . ." the noun is defined by the following relative clause. Welch ‡ agrees with König against Oestreicher that the definite article, prefixed to 'place,' cannot by itself be regarded as distributive and taken as meaning 'any place,' but he seems to think that the further definition afforded by the relative

* $12^{5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26}$, $14^{23, 24, 25}$, 15^{20}, $16^{2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16}$, $17^{8, 10}$, 18^{6}, 26^{2}, 31^{11}. Cp. Josh. 9^{27}, 1 Kings 9^{3}, 11^{36}, 2 Kings $21^{4, 7}$.

† "It is a peculiarity of Hebrew thought to conceive an object as defined by its being taken for a particular purpose and . . . to prefix the article to the noun denoting it": e.g., 1 Sam. 10^{1}, Heb. *the* cruse of oil, 10^{25} *the* book (see R.V.m.), etc. "Nouns which are not definite in themselves acquire definiteness from the context or from the manner in which they are introduced": e.g., Josh. 8^{11} and Sam. 17^{3} *the* valley. The article is also used "with nouns that denote objects or classes of objects that are known to all": e.g., Deut. 8^{3} *the* bread, and, "prefixed to generic nouns (in the sing.), it designates the class, i.e. it imparts to the noun a collective force": e.g., Nu. 21^{7} Heb. *the serpent*, E.V. the serpents. (See the *Oxford Lexicon*, pp. 207–8.)

‡ *Expository Times*, July, 1925.

clause following gives to the phrase, the force of 'such a sanctuary as Yahweh has chosen.' This seems to me more than doubtful. I can find no adequate parallel case in which a noun with the article, followed by a defining relative clause of this type, can be treated as standing for one of a class.*

The words added to the phrase in 12^{14} "in one of thy tribes" increase the difficulty of such an interpretation. Welch says that this means "in any one of thy tribes" and compares it with 19^{5} "the manslayer shall flee unto one of these cities and live," and $23^{17\,(E.V.16)}$ "a servant which is escaped . . . shall dwell . . . in the place he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best." † But this does not help him. It is true that the manslayer and the refugee slave had a choice of cities or gates in which he might dwell, but he could only choose one of them and in that one he had to abide. In like manner Yahweh had a choice of any one of twelve tribes in which His place of worship might be located, but, having chosen "the place in one of" them, that one place was His only legitimate sanctuary.‡ Welch (*Expository Times*, July, 1925) answers that a human being can only choose one place to dwell in, but that Yahweh can choose, and dwell at, any number. He quotes in this connection Ex. 20^{24}, but the phrases are not equivalent. Ex. 20^{1} plainly says: "in every place where I record my name," Deut. 12 does not (see König ‡). Welch has a second

* Cp. Gen. 22^{3} "the place of which God had told him"; Deut. 1^{8}, etc. "the land which Yahweh sware unto your fathers to give unto them"; 8^{2} "the way which Yahweh thy God hath led thee." Note Deut. 26^{1-3} "the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee . . . the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there . . . the land which the LORD sware unto our fathers to give us." How can we take the phrases about the land as signifying one land and take the exactly similar phrase in the same context as referring to a multiplicity of places? The writer of 31^{9-13} clearly means that 'all Israel' is to assemble at the central sanctuary and the law is to be taken out of the ark and read in their hearing.

† *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 48–9.

‡ I see that König (*Z.A.W.*, 1925) and Sellin (in his *History*) take the same line.

answer (in reply to Gressmann on 16^{5-6}), viz. that the Passover law was addressed to 'the people of Ephraim' only. The writer "did not need to use the plural, for to those for whom it was meant there was only one Yahweh sanctuary, viz. their tribal shrine. It is a local law." This seems to be an acknowledgment that if the law was intended for more than one tribe, the plural would be needed. And does Welch contend that the whole Code was for one tribe only? If not, how does he know that 'the passover law' was for Ephraim only? This argument does not square with that which he has hitherto elaborated. Finally when Welch comes in his argument to 12^{5}, "the place which Yahweh your God shall choose *out of all your tribes* to set his name there," he recognises that the section in which it occurs "definitely and uncompromisingly orders the centralisation of the cult." Every kind of offering is to be brought to the one central place. How then does he deal with it? He 'cuts the Gordian knot' by repudiating it as a late addition to the Code proper. The legitimacy of this we must now consider.

ii. It has long been recognised that 12^{1-28} is not a Unity. Carpenter and Harford state this explicitly*: "the question," they say, "has been asked by a long succession of critics . . . whether this law is throughout from the same hand. In outward form it falls at once into two sections $^{2-12}$ and $^{13-28}$, marked respectively by the prevailing use of the plural and the singular address. . . . But further each section contains its own repetitions." Accordingly these editors, like Welch twenty-four years later, divide the passage into 4 sections, $^{13-19}$ and $^{20-27}$ being recognised as earlier and $^{2-7}$ and $^{8-12}$ as later. So far Welch merely follows his predecessors. Where he differs from them is as to the date of 12^{1-7}. Whereas earlier scholars have regarded 12^{1-7} as an integral part of "the book of

* *Oxford Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 268–9 on 12^{2}, and vol. i, p. 278.

the law" which, according to 2 Kings 22, brought about the reformation under Josiah, Welch cuts it out as a late "addition to the original Code, inserted with the intention of laying down a general caveat as to the principle in the light of which all the rest must be read." * He nowhere definitely says when this addition was made, but he seems to hold that it was made from one to two hundred years after Josiah with the object of bringing the Deuteronomic Code into line with the later Priestly legislation. Thus, although he professes to disagree with Hölscher, he really agrees with him that the Code, as we now have it, is exilic or post-exilic, and does demand impracticabilities (p. 197). The main ground given for regarding this section as so late is "a radically different historical view of the conquest, as seen in "the last revision of the book of Joshua" (pp. 57–8). This appears to be a reference to such passages as Joshua 10^{28-43}, $11^{2-3,\ 10-23}$, 12^{1-24}, 23, but these are due to a Deuteronomic writer, whereas "the last revision" was made by a Priestly writer (the greater part of chapters 15–22). On the same grounds he must cut out Deut. 7^{2-5}, 19^{1}, 20^{16-18} (and, in Exodus, 34^{12-16}), for they speak of extermination and destruction in the very same way. The other grounds adduced seem to me to be equally inconclusive, but space forbids comment upon them. The curious thing is that in the same book (pp. 205–6) Welch says that Deuteronomy was too different from the Priestly ideals to be adapted by revision; it was therefore left as it stood, and new laws made for new conditions. But, if 12^{1-7} was added, definitely insisting on an "impracticable" centralisation, was it left as it stood?

iii. By making 12^{1-7} post-Josianic, Welch comes face to face with the statement in 2 Kings 22–23.† As we saw in

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 194–7 and 57–61.

† In a footnote on p. 73 he acknowledges this, "but," he says, "the

section II (above), these chapters unmistakably assert that the reformation of Josiah was carried through on the lines of Deuteronomy and especially of 12^{1-7}. These seven verses demand just the kind of action which the king took. If they were not in 'the book of the covenant' and if, as Welch says, the rest of the book does not demand centralization or make the same sweeping attack upon idolatrous sanctuaries and altars, it is impossible to see how that book came to produce so tremendous a revolution. It seems to me that, although he nowhere explicitly says so, Welch is compelled by the exigencies of his theory to range himself with Kennett and to throw overboard the trustworthiness of the account in Kings. Yet on his very last page he writes: "in the Josianic reform it was decreed that one form of cult at one holy place through one official priesthood was alone legitimate." If king and high-priest and entourage regarded it as practicable to act as they did, why should 12^{1-7} be rejected on the ground that centralization was impracticable? There is a cryptic remark at the end of the section on Deuteronomy in the EXPOSITOR article as to "the need to define more clearly than has yet been done what was the new element which came into the life of Israel at the time of Josiah." Deuteronomy, as he truly says, when emasculated by the cutting out of 12^{1-7} and interpreted on his lines, does not supply anything revolutionary. "The new factor must be in the conclusion drawn from . . . the older body of law. Precisely what this was demands definition." Certainly, if we accept Welch's theory, it does demand it. And I think Welch ought to have given it. Until he does, it would seem much simpler to say that Josiah's book of the covenant did contain 12^{1-7} and that this book, backed by the resolute

critical examination of the account of Josiah's reform cannot find room here." I think that, in the interests of his argument, he should have at least indicated the solution at which he has arrived.

effort of the body of reformers, is a sufficient explanation of the action taken by the king.

3. Let us take two passages of Deuteronomy and see how the theory works out.

i. As an illustration of the way in which Welch has treated the account in 2 Kings, let us take his comparison between the Deuteronomic Code and 2 Kings in the matter of the Passover.* He tells us that, if we understand "the place which Yahweh shall choose" ($16^{2,7}$) as he proposes, the Passover law becomes practicable. It puts into the foreground "three things: (1) Pesach (i.e. Passover) is to fall in Abib and so be linked with the historic past; (2) it is to be celebrated at a purely Yahweh sanctuary; (3) it is to be celebrated in haste, one night only to be spent at the sanctuary and none of the flesh to remain until the morning. He goes on: "These things are ignored in the account of Josiah's passover and what is emphasized as present at Josiah's passover is absent from Deuteronomy." This is an extraordinarily misleading statement. (*a*) One would imagine from its wording that there was a full account of Josiah's passover in 2 Kings. But, as soon as the passage is turned to, it is seen that there is no account at all in Kings of how the passover was kept. 23^{21-23} merely states that (1) "the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto Yahweh your God, as it is written in this book of the Covenant"; (2) no such passover had hitherto been kept; "but (3) in the eighteenth year of King Josiah was this passover kept to Yahweh at Jerusalem." That is all! † (*b*) What does Welch mean by saying:

* Deut. 16^{1-7}, 2 Kings 23^{21-23}. *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 62–78, especially 74.

† The account of the passover in 2 Chron. 35 is so obviously expressed in the language and according to the ideals of the post-exilic writer that it cannot be appealed to as a witness to what actually historically took place.

"these things are ignored," when with one exception no details at all are given? For the way in which the feast was kept the writer refers his readers to "this book of the Covenant." If the Code of Deuteronomy was the whole, or a part, of "this book," we may infer that (1) and (3) were observed; and, as regards (2) we *are* told that it was kept unto Yahweh in Jerusalem." Was not this a celebration at a purely Yahweh sanctuary? It may not be Welch's understanding of "the place which Yahweh shall choose," but it seems to have been the way in which King Josiah understood it and we cannot be surprised that he did so understand it. (*c*) What again is meant by "what is emphasized at present at Josiah's passover is absent from Deuteronomy"? If the words "in Jerusalem" (2 Kings 23^{23}) are referred to, it is true that these actual words are "absent from Deuteronomy," but (1) they could not be put into the mouth of Moses; (2) in Deuteronomy, as it stands, the *thing* is there—in 12^{5-7}, by Welch's own admission * and in 16^{2-7} twice, according to the natural meaning of the words in Josiah's day—and to say that it is not there is to beg the question which is under discussion; (3) no special emphasis is laid upon the words "in Jerusalem." In fact the statement is as unemphatic as possible. Verse ^{22} says: "Surely there was not kept such a passover from the days of the judges . . ." but it does not state that its novel character consisted solely in the particular that it was kept at Jerusalem.

One word more. Welch says †: "Passover had never before been celebrated at the central sanctuary, and it was never so celebrated again." How does he know? Does he rule out Ezra 6^{19-22} as unhistorical? Do not 2 Chron. 30 and 35 point to a contemporary usage familiar to the Chronicler on which he based his account of the earlier

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 58. † On page 71.

celebrations under Hezekiah and Josiah? Later Judaism certainly kept it at Jerusalem (see Talmud [Pesachim], Josephus, Bk. of Jubilees, N.T.).

ii. Kennett and Welch both draw attention to the remarkable passage, Deut. 27^{1-8}.* According to Kennett, the instruction to set up the stones and to build the altar on Mount Ebal "can only mean that at least on one occasion, in spite of the centralisation of worship at Jerusalem, sacrifice was allowed at Shechem. . . . The venerable stones of Shechem were . . . made to witness to the new law [i.e. Deuteronomy] and on the altar of Shechem a solemn sacrifice was offered, perhaps for the last time, by which the Shechemite population entered into a compact to keep the law with the rest of Israel." This is a fine effort of the imagination, but I think few will agree that the injunction "can only mean" that after the Exile and after centralisation a sacrifice was allowed on one occasion at Shechem. Welch also gives somewhat free rein to his imagination. After pointing out various perplexing features of the passage, he appeals to the one unambiguous point. "The author of this section did not believe in centralisation." "He represents Moses as commanding Joshua † to erect an altar on Mount Ebal, to sacrifice on it, and to celebrate a Yahweh festival." This is next expanded into "Moses commanded his successor to institute a local sanctuary." "He [i.e. Moses] carefully provides for the religious needs of his people. They are equipped from the beginning with their own place of worship. Further, the men who wrote this account evidently regarded the sanctuary at Ebal as being the first which was erected in Palestine." Thus

* Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 24–25; "The Date of Deuteronomy" (*J.T.S.*, July, 1906, pp. 493–8); Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 178–185.

† So Welch three times (pp. 179, 181, 184), but the context clearly shows that 'thou' is the nation, not an individual.

" we are carried to Northern Israel and to one of its leading sanctuaries." Yet, if anyone reads the passage in Deuteronomy carefully, he cannot but see that nothing is said about forming a permanent sanctuary for Israel. And he will search the Old Testament in vain to find even a hint that sacrifice was ever offered again on Mount Ebal. The 'great stones' remind Hölscher of Josh. 4^{4ff}; the altar is connected by Sellin with Josh. 8^{30ff}; Kennett regards Deut. 27^{2-8} as probably combining two laws, referring respectively to Gilgal and Ebal. But, whatever be the exact relationship of Josh. 8^{30ff} to the passage in Deuteronomy, it is clear that the writer represents Joshua and all Israel as carrying out the command once for all soon after their entrance into the land and that he has no idea that Israel was thus " equipped with their own place of worship." Welch no doubt, like Kennett, is thinking of Shechem, but in the first place mountain and valley are not the same thing, and in the second place, if Shechem was one of the leading northern sanctuaries, it is curious that never again after Josh. 24^{26} is Shechem mentioned as a sanctuary of Yahweh at all.*

Conclusion.

Is it possible from these conflicting arguments to construct a theory which will cover all the facts ? May we not say that

1. In Deuteronomy we have a compilation of laws and groups of laws, probably laid down at different times, at different centres and by different authorities. Welch happily compares most of them to " the decisions of an ecclesiastical synod in the mediæval period " (p. 189). The laws about firstfruits, tithes and sacrifices may have

* In Judges $9^{4, 46}$, cf. 8^{33} we read of a house of Baal-berith or El-berith at Shechem. Shechem was an important political centre in the days of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, but lost its significance when first Tirah and then Samaria become the northern capital.

originally required only that they should be offered at a local sanctuary.

2. But, if so, experience proved the difficulty of controlling the ritual and customs of these local shrines. A certain school, composed both of priests and prophets, deemed therefore that purity of worship could only be obtained by centralisation. They took the original laws, breathed into them their own ideal, expressed in their own phraseology, altered the phrase which pointed to the local Yahweh sanctuaries into their own characteristic phrase (shaped in various forms) and prefixed a new section, definitely ordering centralisation. Chapters 1–11 may also have been added partly then and partly later. This would account, at once, for those more primitive features to which Welch points, for the actual reformation in the days of Josiah, and for the understanding of the whole book as demanding centralisation, which obtained universally at least from the Exile onwards. Similar views as to the process by which Leviticus 17^{1-9} took its present form are expressed by Driver,* Kittel, Dillmann and others.

We may readily grant to Hölscher and Welch that the men who introduced the ideal of the one central sanctuary may not have fully thought out all its implications, if rigidly enforced. But there was no question of imposing them by force. The appeal is rather to the voluntary obedience of the community.† We may well believe that the Deuteronomic reformers were reasonable men, that they would not demand impossibilities and that distance,

* *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 138. "The most probable opinion is that, as originally formulated (as part of the 'Law of Holiness'), Lev. 17^{1-9} had no reference to a central sanctuary, but presupposed a *plurality* of legitimate sanctuaries, and was only accommodated to the single sanctuary by a modification of its phraseology, when it was incorporated in P," etc.

† See *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 186–7.

infirmities, the hostility of neighbours, etc., etc., would be recognised as conditioning actual observance. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Kennett, Hölscher and Welch for their fresh treatment of the problem of Deuteronomy, but, in spite of all that they have said, we shall, it seems to me, do well to trust in the main the account given to us in 2 Kings 22 and 23 and to believe that "the book of the Covenant," which is said to have led to the reformation under Josiah, was at least the main part of the present Book of Deuteronomy.

J. Battersby Harford.

JESUS AND ART.

Of this power of imagination by which a man not only takes his stand beside another, but puts himself in his place, Jesus was possessed to a degree that is but seldom realized. It is like the emergence of a new thing in the life of humanity, as though it were a new organ added to the stock, or one long hidden brought to light! In any case it stood as far above the range of sympathy as genius stands above that of talent, or as creative art above that of common sight and sense. And it was this great power that operated in his looking out for, or in his welcome to, sinners, and in his mission to the publicans, and in his self-identification with the "least" and with the "lost" among man. In a deeper sense, it would seem, than St. Matthew takes the saying to mean, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."

"Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" was the enthusiastic greeting with which he received Nathanael, a greeting born of his insight both into "the man in every man," and the struggle in this man while under the fig tree, in which he had overcome the lower by the higher self, the Jacob by the Israel. And when the wonder of

Nathanael and his homage were thus aroused, Jesus went on to expand his welcome to the one into a promise to the many. "*Thou* shalt see greater things than these. Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Ye* shall see heaven open wide, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." Which was the vision Jesus beheld at his baptism, the light burning in his own soul and ready to be revealed to all his followers, enabling them to "see" their brethren and his.

There is another instance of this visionary power in the preceding passage, where it is told that "in the morning Andrew finds his brother Simon. . . . He brought him to Jesus; Jesus gazed at him, and said, Thou art Simon, the son of John, thou shalt be called Cephas" (meaning "Peter" or "rock"). To the intent eye of Jesus searching and seeing him in the light of the open heaven, there appeared the promise of something stable like a rock in this child of the Galilean sea, something that bespoke the potential man of steadfast faith and fortitude in the actual man of shifting impulse and desire. A promise which was not belied. Now these reminiscences and others in the Gospel of St. John are all in accord with the portrait of Jesus unfolded in the earlier Gospels. To begin with, one may point to the Beatitudes, every one of which tells not only of the pursuit of a rare and lofty virtue possible to men but of the prospect of a rare and lofty bliss, the bliss of sonship and the sight of God. And it is surely significant that Jesus no sooner began to preach than these ideal sayings burst like music from his lips. Hence it would be true to say that the Beatitude strikes the keynote both of his gospel and of his radiant life among men. For the same spirit which broke into such enraptured language on the mount found expression again and again, as, e.g., in his meeting with the paralytic, and with the Gentile centurion, with the Syrophenician

woman, and with the woman in Simon's house of whom he spoke in words which will never pass away. "Let her alone; why do you trouble her? It is a beautiful thing she has done to me." Nothing, indeed, is so characteristic of his speech and of his spirit as the Beatitude. It is the tone as well as the undertone of his whole being; his atmosphere, his accent and achievement all in one. Had there been but a single beatitude, a single moment of such lively joy as at the return of the seventy one might have taken it to be but a passing transport, a fitful smile flitting across the face of the man of sorrows, but when this moment is only one of many, and the rule rather than the exception, one must needs perceive that here is something that is not passing but persistent, not casual but constant, the deep basal quality, the essence, the effulgence of his life.

For although his preaching began with the Beatitudes, the Beatitudes did not begin with his preaching. The spirit that became articulate in them had already possessed Him at the Baptism, when as he prayed the heaven was opened, and a voice came out of heaven: "Thou art my beloved Son: in thee I am well pleased." That voice and vision brought to light what had been hidden in the silent unrecorded life at Nazareth. They summed up the earlier and began the later stage of his career. He had sowed to the Spirit then and there, and of the Spirit reaped the life which was now his destiny, and was now to be accomplished through his ministry. It was a life of the most intimate and intense communion with the Father and when he began to speak to men he spoke from the heart of this communion and therefore his words were full of the grace and truth of the Beatitudes. The Beatitudes were the song of his lips as they were the "supply" of his spirit to the end. It is impossible to appreciate the speech apart from the spirit, and the spirit of Jesus is his masterpiece, his

finished work, his peerless contribution to the life and art of the world.

Now it was the same spirit flowing spontaneously into the Beatitudes, and not only at the beginning of the ministry, but at signal moments in its course that flowed no less spontaneously into the luminous image of the bridegroom by which Jesus let it be known that he was

> "happy as a lover,"

and that his disciples were taking part with him in a bridal feast. They could not, therefore, be expected to fast or to express the joy or freedom of their life in forms which were not suitable to it. Tradition cannot walk with truth except they have agreed. "Fresh wine must be put into new wineskins." Whether the image belongs to the earlier or to a later stage, as some suppose, it surely belongs to the same world of thought and things as the Baptism and the Beatitudes and the whole position as between Jesus and the Baptist. For while Jesus was closely drawn to John he was just as widely parted from him by virtue of the spirit which abode upon him. Using a distinction which Paul has finely put one might say that while the one lived and taught and wrought in the spirit of "the order that now passes away," with a veil upon his face, like Moses, the other came in and with the spirit of "that which is permanent" and is far more glorious. The veil is removed, "and wheresoever the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Such, briefly, was the spirit of Jesus, original, creative, abounding in grace and truth which one may feel without being able fully to define. For of his life, or of the spirit of his life it would be true to say that

> "life is what none can express,
> A quickness which my God hath kist."

There is no part of the gospel tradition in which one may come so near to this quickness, or be so sure of contact

with it as in the parables. The parable was not original to Jesus, but in his hands, like everything else that he touched, it became a new thing and a signal instrument of his originality. The parables have not all been transmitted in the form in which they were spoken at the first, their artistic unity, their beauty sometimes broken by the intrusion of the moral application which betrays the hand of the evangelist rather than that of the author. Something of the same thing is found elsewhere in all the Gospels. But with this exception which is true of only some of them, the parables are full of an extraordinary charm and brilliancy, and as works of art and religion alike they are as new to-day as in the long ago and their value is imperishable. Born both of the genius of the poet, sensitive to form, and to the needs and susceptibilities of his hearers, and of the genius of the seer rapt by the open vision of the things of God. There is but little indeed in the treasure of his thought which Jesus has not brought out into these glowing tales of his imagining, these flashes of "the quickness which my God hath kist" these

> "swift shapes and sounds which grow
> More fair and soft as man grows wise and kind,
> And, veil by veil, evil and error fall."

If this were the time or place one might deal with the parables in some detail, and try to show that they each present an aspect of his "very varied" thought of God and man and all reflect the newness of his spirit. One of them may, perhaps, be noticed here in passing for the vivid indication which it offers of the new and springlike world to which the parables belong. In depicting "the men of this generation" Jesus made use of a telling illustration drawn from a game which children were wont to play in the market-place, a game in which they appeared now in the manner of a dance and now in that of a dirge, but with-

out being able to attract their playmates to join with them in either dance or dirge. "We piped unto you and you would not dance, we wailed and you would not mourn." "For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say 'He hath a devil.' The Son of man came eating and they say, 'Here is a glutton and drunkard, a friend of publicans and sinners.'" Both alike distasteful and unwelcome to the men of this generation. When they saw the Baptist in his spare ascetic garb, and heard his stern and threatening words they craved for something less severe, and when they saw Jesus living his so free and friendly life, and listened to his genial speech they craved for something more severe, like the children refusing to play the dance or play the dirge. Now Jesus, in so describing his generation, was glancing at the same time, as one may think, at the difference between the message of the Baptist and his own. Jesus came on the scene preaching and saying, as John had said, "Repent, the reign of heaven is near." But whereas in John's lips the words were the mandate of a law, in his lips they were the music of a gospel. The one voice warned men to flee from the coming wrath, the other appealed to men to "Come unto me . . . and I will refresh you." The one speaker held aloof, and dwelt in the wilderness, the other moved about the abodes of men, their radiant healer, teacher, visitant. While the one breathed out threatenings of axe and fan and fire, the other bent down beside men and poured the oil and wine upon their wounds. The one wailed that men might beat their breasts, the other played that men might dance. It is the difference between Law and Gospel, and nothing is so certain as that Jesus' message from the first had in it the singing note which was absent from the utterance of John. It was the Evangel, a fact which the early Christians sought to shadow forth in their picture of the night of the nativity as all alight with

a choir of the heavenly host ecstatic over the advent of the Saviour thus announced, "Be not afraid; for Lo, I am bringing you good news, news of a great joy which shall be to all the people." For as many as received the good news were filled with a great joy, joy so great that words were not able to express it. They caught the lilt, the fervour, the ecstatic spirit of the gospel and made the pages of the New Testament ring as the angels made that holy night. For the New Testament as compared with the Old is a book that sings, as though a cloud had been removed, a dread cast out and the human soul had seen at last the real object of its quest, and seeing could not choose but sing. There is nothing in literature that strikes this new note of exultation like the New Testament. On one occasion it is told that Jesus "exulted in the Holy Spirit," and the same intense word "exult" is found in the song of Mary, and in one of the Beatitudes, in the Gospel of St. John, and the Acts of the Apostles, and elsewhere. Although the word occurs in the Septuagint, the Spirit of the word belongs essentially to the New Testament. It has come to its own in the Gospel.

The writers all through write like men who feel the same, "the Holy Spirit in the heart" and are fain to impart the bliss, the beatitude, as fully as they can. They all dance to the new song. They are the friends of the bridegroom, and leap with joy at the sound of his voice. They rejoice with him over one and another who were lost and are found. They have never seen the like of it before. They see him bringing forth the best robe and putting it on the penitent, and giving him a ring for his hand, and sandals for his feet, and they cannot but revel with him and rejoice. In the New Testament one can hear, or overhear, an air of revel as of a wedding-feast or festival. Frequently the word *εὐφραίνω*, "to revel," is found, mostly, it is true, in quota-

tions from and illusions to the Old Testament, but here again it is touched, like the word "exult," with a new significance. How indeed could those who are the friends of the bridegroom do aught but share his mirth? And further, they are just as ready to share it even when, like Paul and Silas, they are beaten with rods, and cast into the inner prison. Even there they cannot choose but sing. They are fellow-prisoners in Christ Jesus. It does not shock or surprise them that a fiery trial comes to test them as though it were some strange unheard-of happening. They are but sharing what Christ endured, fellow-sufferers with him, and so it becomes them to rejoice in it. And when his glory is revealed their joy will be complete; they will rejoice and exult, which is the same rapturous word as in the phrase "He exulted in the Holy Spirit." "If you are reproached for the sake of Christ you are blessed; for then the Spirit of glory, yes, the Spirit of God is resting upon you" (1 Pet. iv. 12–14). The whole passage rings with the triumphant note of the last of the Beatitudes: "Blessed are you when men reproach you and persecute you and utter all manner of evil against you for my sake: rejoice, and exult in it, for your reward is great in heaven, that is how they persecuted the prophets before you." But no one has grasped the paradox of that beatitude with such daring insight as Paul. For in letter after letter he repeats his own conviction that he is "in Christ" and being in Christ, a member of his body, his sufferings are "sufferings of Christ," "afflictions of Christ."

It is all so real to him, this sense of being "in Christ," "in the fellowship of blood with Christ," which is a fellowship of suffering, that the saying: "I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me," might be altered, as one has truly said, into: "I suffer, yet not I, but Christ suffers in me." Suffering, therefore, is transformed and so far from being acci-

dental, or chaotic, or in vain is native and essential to the highest life of all. And clearly, this is what he means when he breaks out in these impassioned words which have been so long and laboriously discussed: "I am suffering now on your behalf, but I rejoice in that; I am filling up on my part what is lacking of all that Christ has to suffer in my person on behalf of his Body, which is the church." In other words, he perceives there is a sum of suffering which is his to render by virtue of his unity of life with Christ and this he is fain to render to the full. It is a sacred task, or rather a sacred tryst, which fills him with joy.

And the same truth stands in his forefront even of the late Epistle of James where the writer, although he does not connect it in Pauline fashion with the living Christ, connects it closely with the Sermon on the Mount: "greet it as pure joy, my brothers, when you fall in with manifold trials, sure that what is sterling in your faith produces endurance; only let endurance have its finished work that you may be finished and complete, lacking in nothing."

Sayings so original as these, instinct with the newness of the New Testament are due directly to the creative action of the life and death of Jesus. They are the fruit of the Spirit which inspired his followers who are only trying to put into befitting speech what it has taught them or made them feel. For the New Testament is a new world of feeling even more than of speech. In and through its speech there breathes an atmosphere which while it is powerfully is yet only partially expressed in this or that strain of words, however new and true. If it may be compared with anything else it may be compared with that sound from heaven on the day of Pentecost "as of the rushing of a mighty wind, which filled the whole house where they were seated. And they saw tongues like flames distributing themselves one resting on the head of each, and they were all filled with

the holy Spirit." Unquestionably there is this element of wind and of fire in the New Testament, and one must bring some sense or feeling of it to the task of interpretation. Much as there is in the New Testament, in the writings of Paul, and the Fourth Evangelist, e.g. that is borrowed from foreign thought, it is all swept up into the new religion and serves the purpose of its own inner life. Nothing that is borrowed but is transformed by the creative principle which makes it one with itself. The alien is assimilated and becomes ally to the spirit that reigns and reconciles all things in itself. Everywhere the New Testament is instinct like nature with a life and a spirit of its own. A sound as of the wind is in its words, a gleam as of fire that is not quenched. And this is the reason, surely, why Art has been so powerfully attracted to the New Testament, and why it has so often seen or felt or found what scholarship and theology have so often missed. It can express things which can never be expressed in terms of doctrine. In a Latin address to his patron, William Byrd, the English musician who is now placed in the company of the greatest masters, comments on "the beauty of the words themselves," and then proceeds to say "there is a certain hidden power, as I learned by experience, in the thoughts underlying the words themselves, so that, as one meditates upon the sacred words and constantly and seriously considers them, the right notes in some inexplicable manner, suggest themselves quite spontaneously."

That the right notes should thus suggest themselves spontaneously is a striking proof of latent power. And again and again it has been given to Art to capture this latent power, and along with it the wonder of the message which "they heard from the beginning." It has been said that "in that first age the gospel was literally the good news, and the surprise and exultation of good news can only be felt

once." But surely this is not quite true when we think of the newness, a newness, as of nature itself which has drawn the Arts to the New Testament and of the wonder, the pathos and the ecstasy with which they have been able to express the new feeling towards God, and the new attitude to life which make the New Testament what it is. Carlyle says that "all inmost things, we may say, are melodious; naturally utter themselves in Song." If "all deep things are Song" then the fact that music, not to speak of the other Arts, has found so much of its inspiration in the New Testament shows that there is something in common between the soul of the one and the song of the other; that the song is the soul still speaking as it spoke at the first. It is the discovery or recovery, or both, of the melody that lies hidden in the gospel. In other words the type of thought which we owe to Christ is musical or poetic rather than dogmatic and the dogmatic method of interpretation will always fall short as applied to things which can never be fully or fitly expressed in terms of doctrine. And part of the priceless service of the Arts consists in reminding us that there is more than doctrine in the thoughts of Christ, and of his first interpreters, that they are surging with a great life of their own, "a quickness which my God hath kist," glowing with a spirit of grace and power, the wonderful light of an ideal that never was on sea or land before, and that they carry the same appeal to-day as in the long-ago to the imagination and the love which can alone feel them or ever fulfil them. One must therefore agree with the remark of a notable scholar of our time that if Paul had written his letters for future generations, he would not have coined his wonderful expressions for Anselm or Johann Gerhard but for Johann Sebastian Bach.

And this leads to the conclusion of what has now been said as to the supreme reality of the world of imagination,

the world in which Jesus lived his beatific life, and those, too, who saw his glory, and joined themselves to him, and spoke and wrote when they were moved by his spirit. With his long deep gaze he saw into the life of things in nature,

> "A never-failing principle of joy
> And purest passion,"

in man a being "instinct with Godhead," and in God, the Father, Lord of heaven and earth,

> "One Spirit over ignorance and vice
> Predominant in good and evil hearts."
>
> "A gracious Spirit o'er this earth presides
> And o'er the heart of man."

The world was born anew by the visionary power of thoughts like these, it became a new creation after the fashion of his spirit, a work of Art if ever there was a work of Art in the high sense of the poet who wrote,

> "Ah! Then, if mine had been the Painter's hand,
> To express what then I saw; and add the gleam,
> The light that never was on sea or land,
> The consecration, and the Poet's dream."

For that supremely is what Christ added by his life and work upon the earth, and now the winds and waters echo back the accents of his voice, and the ancient hills are vocal with his prayer, and the meadows and the harvest fields break forth into parable, and not an infant of days but wears the halo of his touch, and joy is exalted to beatitude, and peace that passeth understanding is given,

> "nor peace alone,
> But faith sublimed to ecstasy."

There is nothing, indeed, to compare with what this creative spirit in Jesus—love active in imagination—has done and been for the material well-being and the spiritual life and destiny of mankind.

In a remarkable passage a little-known writer[1] says: "What was Christ's view and example in regard to this great faculty of idealism? Why he created a hundredfold more fictitious personages and events than Dickens or Thackeray, or any other novelist ever did. We read that he seldom spoke to the people except in parables. And what were his parables? They were *ideals* that were more vivid than the abstract *reals* of actual human life. They were fictions that were more truthful than facts, and more instructive. They were fictitious transactions, experiences, and actors; but every one of them had a true human basis, or possibility of fact which carried its instructions to the listener's mind with the double force of truth. Take, for example, the Prodigal Son. Historically he was a fiction. But to the universal and everlasting conscience and experience of mankind there has not been a human son born into this world for two thousand years endowed with such immortal life and power as that young man. He will live for ever, he will give power,

> "As long as the heart has passions,
> As long as life has woes."

He will travel down all the ages, and in living sympathy and companionship with the saddest experiences of human nature, he will stand at every door and lair of sin and misery and shame; he will stand there as he stood in his rags, hunger, and contrition among the swine, and say to the fallen with his broken voice and falling tears: 'I will arise and go unto my Father and say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants.'

"The good Samaritan historically was as fictitious a being

[1] Elihu Burritt (*Life and Labours*, by Northend): Lecture on "The Reality and Mission of Ideal Characters."

as the Prodigal Son. But what one man has lived on the earth since he was introduced to the world who has been worth to it the value of that ideal character? . . . For ever and for ever as long as men shall fall among the thieves that beset the narrow turnings of life, or into the more perilous ambush of their own appetites and passions, so long the good Samaritan will seek for them with his lantern in one hand, and his cruet of oil in the other, and pour the healing sympathy of his loving heart into their wounded spirits; and with a hand and voice soft and tender with God's love, raise the fallen, bind up their wounds, and bring them back to the bosom of the great salvation."

JAMES ROBERTSON CAMERON.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

VI

xv. 3. *Christ died for our sins.*

"Learn here from Paul," says Luther, "to believe that Christ was given, not for feigned or counterfeit sins, nor yet for small sins, but for great and large sins; not for one or two, but for all; not for vanquished sins (for no man, no, nor angel, is able to subdue the least sin that is), but for invincible sins. And except thou be found among those who say 'our sins,' that is, who have found this doctrine of faith, and both hear, love, and believe the same, there is no salvation for thee."

xv. 9. *I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.*

"Not in our day," says Matthew Arnold at the close of his essay on *St. Paul and Protestantism*, "will he re-live, with his incessant effort to find the moral side for miracle, with his incessant effort to make the intellect follow and secure all the workings of the religious preception. Of those who care for religion, the multitude of us want the materialism of the Apocalypse;

the few want a vague religiosity. Science, which more and more teaches us to find in the unapparent the real, will gradually serve to conquer the materialism of popular religion. The friends of vague religiosity, on the other hand, will be more and more taught by experience that a theology, a scientific appreciation of the facts of religion, is wanted for religion; but a theology which is a true theology, not a false. Both these influences will work for Paul's re-emergence. The doctrine of Paul will arise out of the tomb where for centuries it has lain buried; it will edify the church of the future. It will have the consent of happier generations, the applause of less superstitious ages. All will be too little to pay half the debt which the church of God owes to this 'least of the apostles, who was not fit to be called an apostle, because he persecuted the church of God.'"

xv. 10. *By the grace of God I am what I am . . not I, but the grace of God which was with me.*

"Rather has it been characteristic of representative men of religion such as St. Paul, St. Augustine, Luther, to disclaim all *merit* and refer all their good actions not to themselves but to 'the grace of God which was with them.' The well-known saying of the Protestant martyr, John Bradford, on seeing a criminal led to execution, 'There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford,' is typical of this religious attitude. How are we to understand this disclaimer of merit? It is, we must note, a disclaimer as against God, not as against man. . . . It is, however, to be observed that although religion, or at any rate a certain type of religion, certainly denies merit to our good actions by ascribing them to the grace of God, it does not, for all that, equate actions which we choose to do, under the impression that there is no alternative open to us, with actions (if actions they can be called) in respect of which we have, as we put it, our choice. The religious man thanks God for his goodness to him in the circumstances of his life, and he thanks him also for his enabling grace; but he distinguishes the two gifts at the same time as he recognizes them as alike manifestations of the favour or the grace of God; and the abolition of the distinction between them would empty of meaning a considerable range of religious experience."

C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, pp. 107, 113.

"I believe the first test of a truly great man is his humility. I do not mean, by humility, doubt of his own power, or hesitation in speaking his opinions; but a right understanding of the relation between what *he* can do and say, and the rest of the world's sayings and doings. All great men not only know their business, but usually know that they know it; and are not only right in their main opinions, but they usually know that they are right in them; only they do not think much of themselves on that account. They do not expect their fellow-men therefore to fall down and worship them; they have a curious undersense of powerlessness, feeling that the greatness is not *in* them, but *through* them; that they could not do or be anything else than God made them."

Ruskin, *Modern Painters* (part iv. ch. 16).

xv. 31. *I die daily.*

"Thy royal father
Was a most sainted king: the queen that bore thee,
Oftener upon her knees than on her feet,
Died every day she lived."

Shakespeare, *Macbeth* (Act iv, scene 3).

"What we possess without intermission," said William Godwin, "we inevitably hold light; it is a refinement in voluptuousness to submit to voluntary privations. I always thought St. Paul's rule that we should die daily, an exquisite Epicurean maxim. The practice of it would give to life a double relish."

xv. 33. *Evil communications corrupt good manners.*

"Do you see," Dr. Arnold once said to an assistant-master at Rugby, "those two boys walking together? I never saw them together before; you should make an especial point of observing the company they keep;—nothing so tells the changes in a boy's character."

In his journal for May 17, 1749, at Limerick, Wesley writes: "I met the class of soldiers, eight of whom were Scotch Highlanders. Most of them were brought up well; but evil communications had corrupted good manners. They all said, from the time they entered into the army, they had grown worse and worse."

Macaulay in 1849 tells of a discussion with some Quakers who objected to his account of William Penn. He declares

impenitently, "I wrote the History of four years during which he was exposed to great temptations, during which he was the favourite of a bad king, and an active solicitor in a most corrupt court. His character was injured by his associations."

"He had, at the law-school, taken part in certain actions which, at the time, seemed to him low, and, even while he was engaged in them, aroused in him deep scorn for himself. But afterwards, finding that these things had been done by men of high position and were not considered by them disgraceful, he came to regard them, not indeed as worthy, but put them entirely out of his mind and was not in the least troubled by the recollection of them."

Tolstoy, *The Death of Ivan Ilyitch* (ch. ii).

xv. 34. *Awake to righteousness and sin not.*

"That is," says Wesley, "and ye will not sin. Sin supposes drowsiness of soul. There is need to press this."

xv. 41. *One star differeth from another star in glory.*

"Mr. Dilly told me," says Boswell in his *Life of Johnson*, "that Dr. King, a late dissenting minister in London, said to him, upon the happiness in a future state of good men of different capacities, 'A pail does not hold so much as a tub; but, if it be equally full, it has no reason to complain. Every saint in heaven will have as much happiness as he can hold.' Mr. Dilly thought this a clear, though a familiar illustration of the phrase, 'one star differeth from another in brightness.'"

xv. 44. *It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.*

"We cannot understand," says Pusey, "what a spirit is, therefore we have no faculty by which to understand God, the Trinity, or the body prepared for us hereafter. 'Spiritual body': it will not be the sluggish thing which now weighs us down."

"The belief in Immortality which forms so important a part of the popular religion of the modern world agrees rather with the Jewish than with the Greek tradition. For it is above all things a belief in the immortality of the *whole individual*; whereas the Platonic doctrine was, or easily passed into being, a doctrine of the immortality, or rather the eternity, of the *Reason*, which transcends the distinction of one individual mind from another in its apprehensions of an object which is common to all minds. The relation borne by this body to the body which we commit

to the earth is in that familiar passage so often heard at the burying of Christian people compared to the relation of the seed to the full-grown plant; but the stress is laid by the apostle rather upon the *unlikeness* of these two than upon the *identity* which unites them on different stages of a single process of evolution. We must observe, however, that this speculation remains true to the Jewish type of doctrine, in that it involves what St. Paul calls in Jewish fashion a 'resurrection,' although he does not call the risen body the *same* with the body that was buried. The immortality to which he looks forward is the immortality of a complete human individual."

C. C. J. Webb, *Divine Personality and Human Life*, pp. 263–265.

xv. 50. *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.*

"'If thou givest thy soul the desires that please her, she will make thee a laughing stock to thine enemies' [Ecclesiasticus xviii. 31];—that is morality. 'He that resisteth pleasure crowneth his life' [Ecclesiasticus xix. 5];—that is morality with the tone heightened, passing, or trying to pass, into religion. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;—there the passage is made, and we have religion."

Matthew Arnold, *Literature and Dogma* (ch. i).

xv. 54. *Death is swallowed up in victory.*

"Without the poignancy of regret for irretrievable loss, without the sense of the fewness and shortness of our days, life would be (we may be disposed to feel) emptied of its peculiar pathos, and death of much of its solemnity. Such reflexions do, as it seems to me, tell against the easy optimism of a certain kind of spiritualistic doctrines which proclaim that 'there is no death,' for our judgments of value here range themselves along with the presumptions drawn from the silence of Nature against beliefs that are at once incongruous with earthly experience and discordant with the deeper harmonies of life. But the religious experience, which is, at least to my thinking, the one strong ground for looking forward to a life beyond the grave, does not, as I understand it, suggest that 'there is no death,' but rather that 'death is swallowed up in victory.'"

C. C. J. Webb, *Divine Personality and Human Life*, pp. 279–280.

xv. 56–57. *The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

"On February 14, Moray was buried in the south aisle of St. Giles. Knox preached from the text, 'Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur,' moving many to tears. His own heart was heavy and full of foreboding. The next day he wrote in his journal: 'And so I end, rendering my troubled spirit in the hands of the eternal God. . . . All debts known to me are paid, death only excepted, which I defy, for the sting of it is destroyed by Jesus Christ, who is my life now and ever.'"

Mrs. McCunn's *Life of John Knox* (p. 197).

xv. 57. *Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

"Thy Saviour comes, and with Him mirth:
Awake, awake,
And with a thankful heart His comforts take.
But thou dost still lament and pine and cry,
And feel His death, but not His victory.
Arise, sad heart, if thou dost not withstand,
Christ's resurrection thine may be;
Do not by hanging down break from the hand
Which, as it riseth, raiseth thee."

George Herbert.

This (verses 56, 57) is the text printed on the mural tablet to the Brontë family in the church at Haworth.

xv. 58. *Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.*

"It is not my work that drives me mad," said Ruskin in old age, "but the sense that nothing comes of it."

"I trust that I have shown that the teaching of morality is no such simple matter, but requires deep and various study, original thought, and copious explanation and illustration. But I do not wish theology to be thrown into the background in order to make room for morality. I am not one of those who think that theology can be dispensed with. Not so much morality as life itself seems to one to require the support of a hope that

goes beyond calculation, and a faith transcending knowledge."

Sir John Seeley, *Lectures and Essays*, pp. 311–312.

After Dr. Arnold's funeral, Mrs. Arnold quoted to Dean Stanley this closing verse of Keble's hymn on the Burial of the Dead :—

"Then cheerly to your work again
With hearts new-braced and set
To run, untired, love's blessed race,
As meet for those who face to face
Over the grave their Lord have met."

"Effect? Influence? Utility?" Carlyle asks. "Let a man *do* his work; the fruit of it is the care of Another than he. It will grow its own fruit."

"Let the lowliest task be mine,
Grateful, so the work be Thine.
If there be some weaker one,
Give me strength to help him on;
If a blinder soul there be,
Let me guide him nearer Thee.
Make my mortal dreams come true
With the work I fain would do;
Clothe with life the weak intent,
Let me be the thing I meant;
Let me find in Thy employ
Peace that dearer is than joy."

Whittier.

xvi. 7. *I trust to tarry awhile with you.*

"One can begin so many things with a new person!—even begin to be a better man."

George Eliot (in *Middlemarch*).

xvi. 9. *A great door and effectual is opened unto me.*

In his journal for February 1, 1736, Wesley writes: "We spoke with a ship of Carolina; and Wednesday we came within soundings. About noon, the trees were visible from the masts, and in the afternoon from the main deck. In the evening lesson were these words: 'a great door, and effectual, is opened.' O let no one shut it!"

xvi. 10. *He worketh the work of the Lord.*

"I ever find it a good antidote to gloomy thoughts to bring

before my imagination the lives of men, utterly unlike me in their minds and circumstances, who give themselves with glad and helpful energy to the plain duties that lie before them. However one's heart may fail in thinking of the folly and baseness which make so great a part of to-day's world, remember how many bright souls are living courageously, seeing the good wherein it may be discovered, undismayed by portents, doing what they have to do with all their strength. In every land there are such, no few of them, a great brotherhood."

George Gissing, *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft* (xxv).

xvi. 13. *Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.*

In a book of Confessions, opposite the question, 'Your favourite motto or proverb?' Charles Kingsley wrote, "Be strong." In the funeral sermon which Dean Stanley preached in Westminster Abbey, he said that the three main lessons of Kingsley's character and career could be summed up in the words: "Watch ye: quit you like men and be strong, stand fast in the faith."

"The courage we desire and prize," said Carlyle, "is not the courage to die decently, but to live manfully."

xvi. 14. *Let all your things be done in love.*

"Men think there are circumstances when one may deal with human beings without love; and there are no such circumstances. One may deal with things without love; one may cut down trees or make bricks or hammer iron without love: but one cannot deal with men without it; just as one cannot deal with bees without being careful. If you deal carelessly with bees, you will injure them and you will be injured yourself. So with human beings."

Tolstoy.

In Ward's account of the brotherhood or community of early missionaries at Serampore, he writes: "January 1st, 1800.—This week we have adopted a set of rules for the government of the family. All preach and pray in turn, one superintends the affairs of the family for a month, and then another. . . . Saturday evening is devoted to adjusting differences, and pledging ourselves to love one another."

Coleridge quoted this to clinch his argument in "The Friend"

(i. 16) for charitable feeling and good temper in reform. "A system of fundamental reform will scarcely be effected by massacres mechanized into revolution. We cannot therefore inculcate on the minds of each other too often or with too great earnestness the necessity of cultivating benevolent affections. We should be cautious how we indulge the feelings even of virtuous indignation. Indignation is the handsome brother of anger and hatred. Let us not wantonly offend even the prejudices of our weaker brethren, nor by ill-timed and vehement declaration of opinion excite in them malignant feelings towards us. . . . Finally, in the words of the Apostle, Watch ye! Stand fast in the principles of which ye have been convinced! Quit yourselves like men! Be strong! Yet let all things be done in the spirit of love!"

"It is terrible to live with a person who has a strong narrow sense of duty without further-reaching thought or love by which the rigidity of duty may be softened."

W. Hale White.

xvi. 15, 16. *I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,) that ye submit yourselves to such, and to everyone that helpeth with us, and laboureth.*

"I could not be content, unless I was found in the exercise of my gift, unto which also I was greatly animated, not only by the continual desires of the godly, but also by that saying of Paul to the Corinthians, *I beseech you, brethren (ye know the household of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints), that ye submit yourselves unto such, and to everyone that helpeth with us, and laboureth.* By this text I was made to see that the Holy Ghost never intended that men who have gifts and abilities should bury them in the earth, but rather did command and stir up such to the exercise of their gift, and also did commend those that were apt and ready so to do, *they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.* This Scripture, in these days, did continually run in my mind, to encourage me and strengthen me in this my work for God."

Bunyan, *Grace Abounding* (269, 270).

xvi. 18. *Acknowledge ye them that are such.*

"To deal with men is as fine an art as it is to deal with ships. Both men and ships live in an unstable element, are subject to subtle and powerful influences, and want to have their merits understood rather than their faults found out."

Conrad, *The Mirror of the Sea* (viii).

xvi. 22. *If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be anathema.*

"True love to God often consists in a dry, firm resolve to give up everything to Him."

Fénelon.

"Our love, being once fixed on Christ, meets with no difficulties of that nature that the love of Christ met withal when it was fixed on us."

John Owen.

Giovanni Papini closes his Life of Christ by crying, "The reign of Satan has reached its full maturity, and the salvation towards which struggling humanity yearns can come but through Thy reign. . . . All the love of which our ravaged hearts are capable is for Thee, O Crucified One."

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "ALLOW me as one who is ignorant of Hebrew to ask this question. In the *Evening News* for December 4th of last year I read that you translate Job ix. 12, 'He pounces—who can stop him?' The reviewer calls this 'an almost flippant rendering,' and says that 'the idea of the Lord "pouncing" could surely only have occurred to Dr. Moffatt.' Is this an intelligent criticism?" (V. C. S., London.)

Perhaps as intelligent as you could expect from the newspaper. The idea of the Lord "pouncing" happened to occur centuries ago to the author of the Book of Job, and he may have been criticized for flippancy by some of his contemporaries—who knows? The verb employed here is the verb used for a beast of prey seizing or pouncing on its prey; it belongs apparently to a group of words employed in this connexion often. The metaphor is one of the many daring figures at the command of

Old Testament writers, and the translation I have given brings out precisely its point. Wherever you come across this sort of criticism, you are pretty safe to consider it a flicker of ignorance and pique, I am sorry to say; reviewers of this class are not almost but altogether "flippant."

(*b*) ". . . You must be worried by ignorant inquirers, but a Britisher has sent to me a cutting from a London paper called *The Evening Standard*, which has a remark I would like you to explain to me. It is concerning 1 Samuel xvii. 29, the passage in which David is talking to his brother Eliab. You render it: '"What have I done now?" said David; "I merely asked a question."' The London paper calls this 'the colloquial touch.' Now, sir, I understand that 'colloquial' refers to conversation, and I presume David and his brother didn't use pulpit-language just at that precise moment, when they were pretty roused. Am I right? Kindly make the thing clear to me." (J. T. A., Baltimore, U.S.A.)

The Authorized English version is, "And David said, What have I now done? Is there not a cause?" The last clause is nonsense; it does not come near the original, which is doubtful but at any rate nothing like this. The phrase may mean either what I have written in my version or "Was it not merely a word?" Eliab is angry, and his young brother replies, "Well, I merely asked a question." What you say about "colloquial" language is to the point. Most newspaper critics do not know the English language, to say nothing of the Hebrew; they confuse "colloquial" with "vulgar." The truth is that the Ciceronian style of the Vulgate and the Elizabethan style of the English Version both obscure the rapid, direct colloquies of the original at several points. This is familiar to those who know the facts, but it seems to be a revelation to some outsiders, and revelations of truth and fact are apt to cause some anguish. I agree that it is tiresome to read these opinions. But not all, even in this country, I assure you, are so impervious to truth as the papers you mention!

(*c*) ". . . As you give no notes, would you be good enough to say why you render Eden a 'park' instead of a 'garden.' It is not that I pay any heed to silly comments in newspapers, but I would like to know exactly why you felt obliged to change our traditional expression." (W. C. S., Manchester.)

Because the traditional expression is wrong. The Hebrew term, as Canon Driver notes in his *Westminster Commentary*, is "rather what we should call a *park*"; this was the sense which the early Greek and Latin translations tried to bring out by words which have brought us the English equivalent of "paradise." Our word "garden" is quite inappropriate to the passage, and no ancient translation ever dreamed of suggesting that the Hebrew writer intended a garden. It was a large sacred grove or park, with many trees in it, not a pretty garden with flowers and walks and seats and all the rest of it! Sentimentalism may like to think of Adam looking after flowers in the plots, but this is false to the facts. In exchanging "garden of Eden" for "park" you gain more than you are losing, although here as elsewhere the loss is at first more evident than the gain.

(*d*) ". . . Though I am not, I hope, a reactionary, I do confess that I am sorry to lose the phrase, 'Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness,' in Psalm xxix. 2. Is this quite indefensible?" (A. M., Edinburgh.)

Yes, the original Hebrew, mistranslated "beauty of holiness," means "sacred vestments" or "festal attire," i.e. the garb worn by priests or worshippers at the sacred festivals of the temple. The R.V. knew this, but the ultra-conservatism which spoiled that version prevented the true rendering from getting beyond the margin, where it appears as "holy array." The margin of the Authorized Version has "his glorious sanctuary," which represents a different reading of the Septuagint. I sympathize with you in regretting that "the beauty of holiness" can no longer be defended as an accurate translation, but it is fortunately enshrined in our devotional vocabulary; it is one of the inspired mistranslations of the English Version. Truth is truth, however, and it cannot be allowed to stand as a rendering of this Hebrew lyric, where the angels in heaven are called upon to praise God like His worshippers on earth.

(*e*) "I desire to preach on Isaiah xxxvii. 31: 'The remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward.' Can you help me to any illustration of this, in later life?" (J. C., Liverpool.)

In Lowell's essay on Pope, he quotes some sentences from Jeremy Taylor about the Countess of Carbery, the lady in Milton's *Comus*, one of which may be of some use to you. "The

religion of this excellent lady . . . took root downward in humility, and brought forth fruit upward in the substantial graces of a Christian, in charity and justice, in chastity and modesty, in fair friendships and sweetness of society." There is also a passage somewhere in one of Professor Henry Drummond's addresses to students, which you might employ in this connexion, if, as I imagine, you mean to show not only that depth of character and experience is needed for a fruitful life but that convictions must come to something in the shape of outward expression. Drummond said that Christ wanted from men "the Christian graces in their fullest and utmost perfection. We hear that as long as men have the *roots* of these things they are all right, and never mind about the graces. What do you imagine a garden like, full of roots only? Beautiful soil yet—nothing but roots!" Newman has a sermon on this text, discussing "The Christian Church a Continuation of the Jewish," but it is not one of his best by any means.

VARIA.

(i) In *The Journal of Theological Studies* (October, 1924, pp. 72 f.) Mr. J. E. Hogg argues that in Exodus xxviii. 36, xxxix. 30, and Leviticus viii. 9, the Hebrew term *tsits* ought to be rendered as usual "flower," instead of "plate." What Aaron as high-priest wore was a turban surmounted by a golden flower; if we fill out the description from Josephus we see a triple band of gold on the turban, which rose at the back and on the sides into a cup-like flower, while the words "holy to Yahweh" were inscribed on the plain front of the ornament. He further conjectures that the Hebrew phrase generally rendered "holy (holiness) to Yahweh" may have meant "the holy name of Yahweh," so that here, as in Zechariah xiv. 20, 21, all that was actually inscribed was "Yahweh," "the holy name" being simply descriptive.

(ii) In *Biblica* (1924, pp. 375–390) P. Franz Dunkel writes a note on fishing in the Sea of Gennesareth, using personal observation to throw light upon the New Testament allusions. The various nets used are (*a*) a small hand-net, of circular shape (Lagrange, by the way, in his commentary on Mark calls it "un grand filet rectangulaire," by mistake). Now-a-days it is only

used from the shore, the fisherman either standing on the bank or wading [1] in, when he sees a shoal of fish. The Arab name for it is *schabakah*. A larger net, the *garf*, is generally worked by two boats, which separate and then draw it in a sweep to the sandy shore, enclosing the fish like trawlers. A third kind of net, the *mbattan*, is used when the shore is rough or deeply shelving; it is a long net, supported on cork buoys, like the *garf*, but worked by a single boat, commonly holding four men, who after stretching the net out splash the water in order to scare fish into the meshes. Line fishing is also practised in stormy weather, the best season for ordinary netting being from the middle of December to the middle of April. Dunkel enumerates the various kinds of fish found in the lake, and then proceeds to discuss the New Testament allusions. The *δίκτυον* is the generic term for a net, large or small. The *ἀμφίβληστρον* of Mark i. 16, Matthew iv. 18 is the modern *schabakah*, while the *σαγήνη* of the parable in Matthew xiii. 47 is the *garf*. Dunkel warns us not to press the words *ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος* in Luke v. 4; fish are not caught out in the deep sea, but generally close to the shore, and the words mean no more than "push out into deeper water." Here the net used must have been the *mbattan*.

(iii) In *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (1925, pp. 164 f.) Alphonse Tricot sees in Acts i. 15 and 25 traces of Aramaic style. In the former passage, *ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡσεὶ ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι*, the use of *ὄνομα* in the sense of "person" points to the use of an Aramaic written source; *ὀνομάτων* is the rendering of the Aramaic שְׁמוֹת. Again, in i. 25, *πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον* seems "un euphémisme, d'origine araméene, pour dire tout simplement que Judas est mort."

(iv) In the same magazine (pp. 167–168) Gustave Bardy calls attention to the old Latin version of Mark iii. 17, *communiter autem vocavit eos boanerges*, which implies that Jesus called all his disciples by that name. There is a parallel to this tradition in the pseudo-Cyprianic treatise *de singularitate clericorum* (ch. xxi) and also one in the *Sermo de Contubernalibus*, attributed to Basil. But M. Bardy does not think that such scattered patristic allusions imply any use of the curious Latin version;

[1] Hence, if one cared to press the point, *ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ* in Mark i. 16 might be correct, and not necessarily an equivalent for Matthew's *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν*.

there may have been, he thinks, an interpretation independently current in the church, which made all the apostles, not simply James and John, the sons of Thunder.

(v) In *Biblica* (1925, pp. 165–171) F. M. A. Vanden Oudenrijn discusses the term "sons of the prophets," a term only current in Northern Israel between 850 and 750 B.C. He adduces evidence to prove that such a term is due to Aramaic idiom, and that the language of such prophetic guilds must have been influenced by Aramaic.

(vi) The question of the historicity of Jesus, which has again rippled the surface of French thought, as Professor Goguel's recent book shows (see EXPOSITOR for July, pp. 72 f.), is briefly discussed by Professor Guillaume Baldensperger in "Un demi-siècle de recherches sur l'historicité de Jésus," an article contributed to the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (1924, pp. 161–201). Baldensperger notices the views of Couchoud here and there, and he also mentions another French work, published in 1923, by R. Stahl, which takes the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, with its vision of the Woman and the Child, as the prototype of the Christian gospels. Baldensperger's main argument is drawn from an analysis of Mark's gospel, which implies a series of earlier missionaries and prophets; these primitive evangelists know not only that Jesus had lived but what he said, and their authentic traditions are embodied in our earliest canonical gospel. He fully admits that Mark's gospel contains edifying matter from a date later than Jesus. Thus, for example, he heartily agrees with M. G. Dupont, who in his recent monograph on *Le Fils de l'Homme* (1924) denies that Jesus ever called himself Son of Man in a messianic sense; this sense was the work of believers after the resurrection, and it has been read back into the Marcan record of what Jesus actually said. But such an admission leaves Professor Baldensperger all the more free to argue that the historical substance underlying the Marcan traditions implies a definite, actual Jesus. "Les versets de Marc sur le Fils de l'Homme qui a le droit de pardonner, ou qui est maître du sabbat, se détachent aisément de l'ensemble et se dévoilent comme des additions dues aux croyances christologiques des didascales. Ainsi donc le genre archaïque de ces leçons marciennes est incontestable, malgré les retouches des générations suivantes." Thus his radical analysis of Mark is

made a plea for recognizing the futility of the hypotheses that evaporate Jesus altogether.

(vii) The meaning of 2 Corinthians iv. 4 is discussed by Wilhelm Müllensiefen in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1924, pp. 295 f.). Does Paul describe Satan as the god of this world, *θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*? Would not that be ascribing to Satan what is elsewhere ascribed to God Himself (e.g. in iii. 14=Rom. xi. 8)? Rather take *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* with what follows, and translate, "God blinded the minds of the unbelieving of this world." That is, *τῶν ἀπίστων* must be translated as if it preceded *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, "this age" being opposed to God as in 1 Corinthians ii. 6–7. The construction is not new, of course. As early as the second century this collocation of *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* and *τῶν ἀπίστων* was favoured by Irenæus (*Haer.* iv. 48), Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iv. 11), and many other patristic writers, probably in order to avoid the suggestion of dualism implied in the ordinary version. Müllensiefen appeals to other New Testament passages where a genitive is similarly out of place, from our modern point of view, e.g. 1 Peter iii. 21 (*σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου*) and Apocalypse vii. 17 (*ζωῆς πηγὰς ὑδάτων*).

(viii) Dr. Joseph Frings, in the *Biblische Zeitschrift* (1925, pp. 75–88), is dissatisfied with the ordinary interpretations of 1 Peter iii. 19 and iv. 6, and proposes to interpret the latter passage in a novel way. "The gospel was preached to the dead" refers to Christians who had died (*νεκροί*) before the second coming. Peter deals with their fate, as Paul had done in 1 Thessalonians iv. 13 f. He reassures their surviving friends by declaring that these Christians, though they had been exposed to a "judgment" of death (cf. ver. 17), would live in the spirit. Dr. Frings objects to iii. 19 being taken as an anticipation or explanation of iv. 6. Incidentally he agrees with those who take the *κηρύσσειν* of iii. 19 in the general sense of proclamation, the spirit in prison receiving no "gospel" but merely a declaration of their just doom from Christ as Judge.

REVIEWS.

The Gospel According to St. Mark. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson. London: Methuen & Co. Pp. lx, 278. Price 16*s*.

As in the other volumes of the Westminster Commentaries, the Revised Version is used as the basis, and readers are not expected to know Greek. But Mr. Rawlinson's interest in textual and critical issues has led him to take the reader often behind the scenes into discussions of what the original text may have been, and of the strata and structure of the gospel. Canon Streeter's book has plainly influenced him. Critically he takes the position that the gospel was written, as it stands, by John Mark, between A.D. 65 and 67, and that it was never finished. This is argued soundly. He also thinks that the gospel was written at Rome, but why Mark must have used a Roman form of Q is not made clear. That Mark used Q at all is an hypothesis which rests on the assumption that certain sayings of Jesus were only accessible in Q, and this seems quite ultra-literary. However, the introduction as a whole is vigorous and acute, with suggestions now and then which are inviting. One is that the depreciatory tone of the allusions to Peter is only intelligible if we assume that the gospel was written after his martyrdom, which had finally redeemed his character, the humiliation and shame of his early life having been "washed out in blood." Besides, the story of his faults and failures, so far from discrediting him, served as "an encouragement to martyrdom" for the readers. This may sound subtle, but, if you grant that the book was written to hearten early Christians in these dark days, it is not unreasonable.

The notes are refreshingly independent, and always to the point. I doubt if he realizes, however, the criticisms that have been made upon Jülicher's theory of the parables. Nor can I see how the incident of ii. 1–12 was meant "primarily as a vindication of the Church's great dogmatic claim to declare the forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus." One merit of Mr. Rawlinson's book is that he places the gospel in the living context of the early Christian Church, but it is possible to draw too sharp conclusions from this. The historical criticism is frank, though the editor gives small light upon the actual meaning of the miracles, which are generally viewed as embodiments of "some actual historical

reminiscence, the details of which cannot now with any certainty be recovered." The story of the cursing of the fig-tree is admitted to "approximate more closely than any other episode in Mark to the type of 'unreasonable' miracle, characteristic of the uncanonical Gospel literature."

The book deserves much more detailed notice than can be given it here. It is a strong edition, stimulating and excellently equipped. One only wishes he had been able to work at first hand upon the Greek text.

* * * * *

Die Auferstehung Christi in der urchristlichen Ueberlieferung. By Lyder Brun, Dr. Theol., Professor an der Universität Oslo. H. Ascherlong & Co. (W. Nygaard), Oslo. 1925. Pp. 97.

The so-called "Formgeschichtliche," or, as Professor Brun prefers to call it, the "Traditionsgeschichtliche" method of criticism has been already applied to the narratives of the resurrection by M. Albertz in a short paper contributed to the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1922, pp. 259–269). Professor Brun is not quite satisfied with Albertz's argument. He essays a fuller treatment of the subject, along the same lines. Too much attention has been paid, he thinks, to an examination or a harmonizing of the separate stories, instead of analysing the common motives and content of them all. So far as this common material enables us to differentiate the narratives, it is into individual and collective visions. The predilection for the latter, as tradition developed, may explain why there is no story of the appearance of the risen Lord to Peter, an appearance which was primary. There are three accounts of the risen Lord appearing to Paul, but none of Peter's vision, which is merely alluded to! Brun, it should be added, does not confine himself to the New Testament stories; he discusses later tales and traditions such as those of the Gospel of Peter and the Epistle of the Apostles. His treatment is comprehensive, more comprehensive than any previous study, and it is not lost in details. The concluding chapter discusses the story of the Ascension in Acts i. 9 f., etc.; for Luke, as Brun points out, the Ascension had a triple significance, it rounded off the resurrection-appearances, it showed the elevation of Christ to God's right hand, whence He sent the Spirit, and it pointed forward to the Parousia as the final stage.

Brun analyses the various strands in the traditions, the careful dating of the resurrection on Sunday, the sense of awe, the motive of witnessing, and so forth. But when all is said and done, his pamphlet leaves us pretty much where we were. This *Formgeschichte* method is curiously unfruitful. It would be too much to say that it is profitless, but it stops short of the real problems, and it does not often enable us to see these problems more clearly. Certainly, to distinguish story-material and sayings-material in the Passion-narratives does not appear to carry us very far, in spite of Brun's care and patience in working out the method. Much more is to be gained by reading an article like that by Mr. Jacks in the April number of the *Hibbert Journal*. The effort to reach a pre-literary stage in the tradition of the Passion is legitimate, but, even after reading Brun's excellent presentation, I cannot help feeling that it is unsuccessful.

One small point of criticism, in literary matters, may be noted. Brun agrees with those critics, like E. Meyer recently, who regard Mark xvi. 8 as the original conclusion of the gospel. This is most unlikely; Mark has sudden conclusions, like vi. 51–52 and xiv. 33, but none is an exact parallel to xvi. 8, and it is quite impossible to suppose that Mark intended his story of the resurrection to end as it does. Brun claims that Mark xvi. 1–8 is as independent a unity as Luke xxiv. 1–11, but he has to omit Luke xxiv. 12 in order to win this doubtful confirmation of his hypothesis.

* * * * *

A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron. By Dr. D. Plooij. Leyden: E. J. Brill, Ltd. Pp. 92.

This is a sequel to Dr. Plooij's monograph, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron*, published two years ago, and discussed in the Expositor for July, 1923 (pp. 56–60). Dr. Plooij held that the Latin text of the Diatessaron, underlying the Liège mediæval Dutch harmony of the Gospels, was closely connected with the text of Ephrem's commentary, and he further argued that the Old Latin Diatessaron was a translation from the Syriac original. These and other speculations about the Diatessaron have been rigorously debated. Dr. Plooij now writes a fuller study of the text, in order to remove misunderstandings. It is a valuable, technical examination of the linguistic data, as bearing on the tradition of the Diatessaron

in Latin and Syriac. Three lines are followed; Old Latin and Syro-Latin readings, then Syriasms and Syriac readings, and finally Marcionite readings in the Liège text, are analysed. The cumulative force of the evidence is held to tell in favour of the view that the Old Latin Diatessaron was a translation from the Syriac, and that the Greek Gospels were not rendered into Latin until after the Old Latin Diatessaron, i.e. about the eighth or ninth decade of the second century.

An interesting inference is to be drawn from this conclusion. The earliest Latin literature of the Church must have been this Diatessaron and a Latin version of Marcion's Gospel used by Tertullian. The latter was "written in a vulgar illiterate language which offended the literary taste of Tertullian." Now, Dr. Plooij argues, if Tatian made his Syriac Diatessaron for Oriental Christians at Rome, Carthage, and Lyons, then there must have been some close connexion between them and the Latin-speaking section of the Church. Were not Latins and Syrians in the Early Church nearer to one another than to the Greeks? Does this not explain the connexion between the Early Latin and the Early Syriac texts of the New Testament?

Such are some of the hypotheses propounded in this book. But its value lies in the careful discussion of some textual problems, on which the hypotheses are based. Students of the New Testament text are once more indebted to the Dutch scholar for a keen, pioneering bit of work in a region which is dimly lit.

* * * * *

The Early Church and the World. A History of the Christian Attitude to Pagan Society and the State, down to the Time of Constantinus. By C. J. Cadoux, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Pp. lii, 675. Price 21*s.*

This large and learned book contains a survey which falls into six periods. After discussing the principles laid down by Jesus in founding His Church, the author proceeds to view the earlier apostolic age (A.D. 30–70), the later apostolic age (A.D. 70–110), the period of the earlier apologists (110–180), the period of the great thinkers (180–250), and the period of final struggle and settlement (250–313). During these three centuries the relation of Christians to their environment changed, as the environment changed. In the beginning of the fourth century the Church

was face to face with responsibilities which had hardly been dreamed of in the earlier period when persecutions raged. It is true that after the reign of Commodus there are occasional traces of a more positive interest displayed by some Christians in public affairs, but it was not until the policy of Constantine began that anything like a constructive attitude arose. In the nature of things, Christians could not afford now to be indifferent to the State or to criticize its methods, as if that were the sum of their duties. All this is obvious. It is a tale which has been often written forcibly and brilliantly. But Dr. Cadoux believes that in the original teaching of Jesus Himself there was a more definite attitude laid down towards the State than most scholars are prepared to admit, an attitude of idealism which the Church for various reasons more or less failed to realize. He argues that the teaching of Jesus implied that " ultimately governments, in so far as they involve the infliction of penalties by man on man, should come to an end." Love excludes injury, and by injury he seems to mean punishment and disciplinary methods, indeed anything approaching to severity, as though the kindest thing in love may not sometimes be severity. Starting from this interpretation of the Christian principle, which was meant to be embodied in the Church, he views the subsequent literature and life of the society. It follows that when he meets a passage like Romans xiii. 1 f., where Paul like Jesus frankly recognizes the political authority of the day as possessing divine rights, he sees no more in it than a recognition of " the principles of a providentially ordered system of *pagan* checks on pagan crime," a system which was not merely temporary but " framed on a lower level than that of the Christian life." The thesis is worked out rigidly along such lines. The presupposition is that the gentle redemptive ethics of Jesus forbade anything like the use of judicial penalties. This is what really engrosses the author's attention. He reads the history in order to justify such a position. For, although he mentions the general problems of the Christian in relation to the ethical standards and problems of the time, it is with the State that he is chiefly concerned. The result is that the book becomes rather unbalanced. Besides, a frankly " pacifist " prejudice controls some of the leading chapters till they become as unconvincing as they are ingenious. Apart from this bias, however, the book will be found service-

able as a painstaking guide to most of the relevant issues raised by the title. We have no up-to-date work in English which covers the ground exactly, and those who can discount Dr. Cadoux's pacifist predilections will profit by his laborious and minute investigations of the evidence. When he forgets to worry about war, and to write as though the early Church was or ought to have been worried about this particular issue, his pages repay labour, although the problems of casuistry ought to have received larger attention in connexion with some of the private ethical difficulties.

Some of the author's positions are hazardous. Thus, he refuses to admit that in 1 Corinthians ii. 6 f. the allusion of the apostle is to spiritual powers on the apocalyptic scheme. Similarly he makes far too much of a saying like that of 1 John v. 19 : *The whole world lieth in the power of the Evil One.* Is this " a fairly representative summary of the general Christian position " towards pagan society and the State in especial ? Surely one ought not to read so much into the general statement of a mystical writer, who was not penning a sweeping historical judgment. There is no evidence that he had any problem of the State and Church before his mind. But Dr. Cadoux here as elsewhere presses unduly the evidence against the State, as he reads his texts. In discussing the Tacitus-passage (p. 100) I observe he is disposed to agree with those who think that some Christians actually confessed the guilt of having set Rome on fire. There is a case for this view, which has been put by critics like Arnold, Schiller, Klette, and Henderson ; there may have been fanatical enthusiasts in the Roman community, or Christians who were tortured into giving false evidence. It is a doubtful point, however. And in any case it is hardly historical to speak of Nero's " persecution," for it was not a persecution in the technical sense of the term. To mention another detail, it is unsafe to quote Lampridius without hesitation for the religious views of Severus ; some years ago Karl Bihlmeyer wrote an essay on Lampridius which gives pause to anyone who desires to employ that ancient biographer as an authority. Also, in referring to Tröltsch's estimate of the relations between the Church and society in this period, it is always well to recollect what Otto Schilling has urged in his essay upon " Naturrecht und Staat nach der Lehre der alten Kirche." Schilling has adduced some considerations which

suggest reserve in accepting Tröltsch's historical arguments at more than one point.

The volume is elaborately indexed and clearly printed. Dr. Cadoux makes a defiant apology for spelling some proper names unconventionally. By the time we have finished his book we are accustomed to formations like "Herodes," "Origenes," "Tertullianus," and "Meliton," accustomed if not reconciled.

* * * * *

The Doctrine of Grace. By Ernest Jauncey, M.A., B.D. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. ix, 299. Price 14*s.* net.

Mr. Jauncey's book is conscientious and painstaking. It is really a semi-historical survey of the subject, which ends with the Pelagian controversy. He intends to complete his work by tracing the development down to modern times; meanwhile, his pages contain an account of the earlier stages during which the doctrine was formulated, first of all in the New Testament, then in the early church of the first four centuries, and finally in the controversy between St. Augustine and what Ruskin called the characteristically British theory of Pelagius.

The discussion of the New Testament teaching is mainly exegetical, and, it must be confessed, too orthodox to be vital; for more is required than an analysis of references. Grace is God's loving purpose manifested in the history of His People; it is impossible to isolate this aspect of Christianity from others, and therefore the chapter on the New Testament suffers from a certain one-sidedness. One has the impression that even the exegesis tends to become rather verbal, and that the repeated inclusion of broader references does not clarify the thought. It would have been more serviceable to present a summary of the Pauline doctrine, for that is the central representation in the New Testament.

Mr. Jauncey notes that the Johannine ideas predominated in the Eastern Church, while the Pauline conception prevailed in the Western, especially when St. Augustine wrote and argued. Free-will never troubled the East as it did the West. Consequently the conception of grace in relation to man's weakness did not raise difficulties in the East, whereas in the Western Church the relation of divine grace to a human nature whose will-power was conceived to have been weakened by sin led to a tension which culminated in the Pelagian controversy. The latter part of Mr.

Jauncey's book is occupied by a detailed discussion of the issues at stake. The story has been often told, for its dogmatic significance. Mr. Jauncey gives a useful summary, with quotations, which will enable the reader to follow the various developments of the controversy, into which St. Augustine was drawn as the protagonist of the anti-Pelagian party. The student who knows Loofs's *Leitfaden* or the recent studies by Alfaric and Batiffol, will not find anything fresh here, but ordinary English readers are undoubtedly helped by the careful examination of the data, which supplements the excellent summary of Mr. R. G. Parsons in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The book is written in the interests of dogmatic orthodoxy. If it is to be completed, a more flexible spirit of appreciation will be needful, in order to do justice to later speculations. No reviewer would desire to be ungrateful to Mr. Jauncey. But the method employed in this book does not seem adequate. Grace is bound up with problems of freewill and predestination, of pardon and faith, in a complex which requires much more than verbal discussion or ecclesiastical description. We need to know how far the vital ideas of Christianity were present to the mind of the respective writers in any period. Either to isolate the doctrine of Grace or to identify it loosely with the Christian religion is inadequate, although the latter method is infinitely more sound. Histories of doctrine tend to become as wearisome as histories of literature; they easily drop into a second-hand relation to the life which produced their respective subjects. It is rare to find a theologian like Ritschl who can not only think but describe the historical evolution of doctrine.

* * * * *

The Glory of God. By I. Abrahams. Oxford University Press. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*

This small book contains three lectures delivered to Jewish audiences in America during the spring of 1924. They are marked by the qualities of religious sympathy and scholarship to which we are accustomed in the work of Dr. Abrahams. It is not difficult to read these seventy or eighty pages in which he speaks discursively and pleasantly upon some aspects of his great theme as that is reflected in the Old Testament and in rabbinical writers early and mediæval. Nevertheless one has a certain feeling of disappointment. "Glory" like "Holiness" defies

definition as a religious term, but it challenges thought ; it is one of the deepest ideas in Hebrew religious life, and we can trace its evolution from a quasi-material manifestation of the Deity in storm and cloud up to the more spiritual expression in some of the prophets. One expects much from the title. The topic is so promising that it excites high expectations. But Dr. Abrahams is content to start from some criticism on Von Gall's standard treatise, contending that the pre-exilic references are not wholly external, and to illustrate his views by quoting some rabbinical passages which are on a much lower level. His main interest, he admits, lies in the Jewish aspects of the theme. This is natural, but it involves serious limitations. Thus, the omission of any allusion to the full flowering of the idea in the Christian religion leaves a regrettable gap. Dr. Abrahams speaks of the pleasure he has had in recognizing " how much of good there is in common between the Church and the Synagogue, on a theme which probes deep into the heart of fundamental spiritual concepts, and also deep into the noblest ideals of human conduct." Yet the student of comparative religion notices that there is an experience in the Church which is more than anything common to Church and Synagogue on this matter. *We have seen His Glory*, said the first Christians. The deep import of God's Glory in the character of Jesus Christ is on a plane infinitely higher than any of the rabbinic intuitions chronicled by Dr. Abrahams. Hence, the appreciation of God's Glory, as drawn in these pages, seems curiously vague and defective, although on the circumference of the subject some of the author's touches are characteristically sure and fresh, as for example on the significance of the nineteenth psalm and the theology of the prophet Ezekiel.

* * * * *

The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil. Translated into English, with Introductory Notes. By W. K. L. Clarke, D.D. London : S.P.C.K. Pp. 362. Price 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is a welcome sequel and supplement to Dr. Clarke's monograph upon the great Cappadocian Father of the fourth century, the founder of Greek monachism. The ten works translated and annotated contain the Longer and Shorter Rules, which exercised so profound an influence upon Western monasticism. Dr. Clarke has laid all patristic students under a heavy

debt of gratitude to him for this edition. It is based upon the Benedictine text, and provided with a minute study of the New Testament quotations, mainly for the purpose of throwing light upon the authority of the writings; thus, the *Sermo de Renuntiatione Sæculi* is pronounced unauthentic, as are the *Sermo de Ascetica Disciplina* and the *Sermones Ascetici*. The importance of Basil's organization of monasticism makes a volume like this particularly serviceable to readers who desire to know at first-hand the motives and methods of the ascetic discipline, as it developed in various circles. Thus Dr. Clarke claims to prove that Basil "originated the conception of confession as a regular practice and means of grace for those who are striving after holiness." It appears also that Basil was the first to enforce the binding nature of monastic vows.

The book has taken seventeen years to write. Dr. Clarke issues it with a remark which is not common in patristic studies: "I relinquish my labour of love with thanks to God for many happy hours, and a prayer that St. Basil may be allowed to know about my devotion to his memory and to pray for me; also that I may be privileged to meet him one day."

* * * * *

Selected Poems of Jehudah Halevi. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1924. Pp. xxviii, 192.

This is the second volume of what promises to be an attractive series called "The Jewish Classics." Like the Loeb series, it is to present the original Hebrew along with an English version; the text is to be critically prepared, and English readers are in this way to be shown some of the treasures of Jewish literature. Josephus and Philo are left to the Loeb series. The expenses have been in the main met by means of a fund generously presented by the late J. K. Schiff, and the editorial duties are undertaken by a small committee of Jewish scholars, whose names guarantee excellence of judgment.

The present volume is bound in purple, clearly printed, and attractively edited. It consists of a version by Mrs. Nina Salaman, who is already known as a translator of mediæval Jewish poetry. Mr. Zangwill's translation of selected poems by Ibn Gabirol is thus followed by another volume of selected verse, and no better choice could have been made than Halevi, the Spanish Jew of the eleventh century, whose writings stirred men

like Herder and Heine. According to Mrs. Salaman, who estimates Halevi more highly than Mr. Joseph Jacobs did, the poet is graceful. Also, he is an ardent lover of his religion. For him, "Israel is the heart of mankind, filling the same function in the world at large as does the heart in the body of man." The latter faith is clear. The former quality of gracefulness is more difficult to appreciate, but the translations enable the reader to see what Mrs. Salaman means by her claim. Halevi, like Herrick, for example, wrote erotic as well as devotional verse, and this is one of his love-songs:

"The bridal pair stand amid the myrtles,
Sending forth pure myrrh on every side.
The myrtle desireth the sweetness of their fragrance,
And spreadeth his wings like a cherub above them.
The myrtle thinketh to cover their fragrance,
But the sweetness of their spices overwhelmeth his scent."

But his songs of Zion are more characteristic, for Halevi travelled in Palestine and was devoted to the Holy Land. One of his lyrics run thus:

"O Sleeper with heart that waketh,
Burning and tempest-torn,
Go, shake thee, walk with My radiance
Upon thee borne.

"Rise up, ride on and prosper:
A star shall guide thy quest,
Till he that lay down in the dungeon
Reach Sinai's crest.

"Let not their soul be joyful,
Which talk of Zion's despair,
For there My heart is ever,
And Mine eyes are there.

"I reveal Myself and I hide Me,
I am wroth, I restrain the rod;
For who should pity My children
But I, their God?"

The Hebrew text is that prepared by Dr. Heinrich Brody of Prag, who has added some critical notes. Altogether, the volume is a distinct acquisition, and we hope the series will continue to furnish volumes of the same excellence and freshness.

The Master-Idea of Saint Paul's Epistles, or The Redemption. A Study of Biblical Theology. By Rudolph G. Bandas. Bruges (Belgium): Desclée, de Brouwer & Co. 1925. Pp. xxix, 432.

The Gospel that Jesus Preached and the Gospel for To-day. By A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. Pp. 248. Price 6*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Bandas's volume is one of a long series of graduation theses published by the University of Louvain. Originally all the publications were in Latin; more recently they have been mainly French; now for the first time one appears in English. The author's preface tells us that he was introduced to English theological literature by the courtesy of the librarian of the University of Cambridge. We learn further from the Bibliography that he has been a contributor in English to a Roman Catholic journal of theology published in the United States. The present volume mainly, though not invariably, quotes German Protestant literature in English translations. Belgian printers and publishers have carried out the production of the volume in our language. There are traces of American spelling, and it appears that an American priest, domiciled at Rome, has read the proofs. The author is remarkably at home in English; nevertheless he betrays himself as a foreigner from time to time. When he charges the present writer with "lack of distinction" (p. 59), it is apparent that he means lack of the power of drawing distinctions. On p. 195 the French form "conscience" is repeatedly employed where English people say "consciousness." "Salutary value" (p. 225) and "no opprobrium for Christ" (p. 370) strike the ear very oddly. "Anthropometric" (p. xvi) is perhaps a compositor's attempt at the word "anthropocentric." The author allows himself undue rhetorical copiousness. And one quotation from myself (pp. 23, 24) does not, as he implies, represent my own view, but a view which I was summarizing—not adopting. Such a slip creates a bad impression, all the more when it is associated with so seemingly complete a guarantee of accuracy as word for word quotation.

The book begins with a discussion of sin, as a doctrine presupposed in the doctrine of salvation, and antecedent to it; Part II discusses the Redemption, and Part III Humanity after the Redemption. A modern Protestant cannot recognize such

biblical theology as the title page promises. The whole statement is dominated by the Church's formulated doctrinal conclusions, which may be definite or evasive but in any case rank as authoritative. "Two elements enter into the notion of sin; an interior disorder (*reatus culpæ*), which constitutes the fault and implies in some way a diminution of the divine honour, because the order whereby we should tend to God as our Supreme Good and Last End has been disrupted, and secondly an exterior disorder (*reatus pœnæ*) which is an obligation to undergo a penalty" (p. 227). A footnote assures us that "this idea is clearly stated by Medebielle." Very true, no doubt, but not by St. Paul—and that is what matters to us at the moment. We want Paul's thoughts, Paul's groupings, Paul's ways of approach.

The author has read widely, but he seems to be quite incapable of entering into the point of view of the Protestants to whom he devotes so much of his attention. Any talk about the theology which is based upon experience bewilders him, and makes him angry. Did he ever ponder St. Paul's programme of "commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God"? There are Roman Catholic theologians in whom one plainly recognizes the "anima Christiana"; David may be awkwardly cased in Saul's armour, yet he is our own kinsman and we greet him gladly. It seems to content this theologian if he tabulates authoritatively revealed truths according to the mind of his Church, or helps out his case by stating objections against other forms of belief. St. Paul, of course, is made correctly Roman Catholic at every point, with eagerly welcomed help at times from Protestant scholars—Imputation is a figment of Protestant orthodoxy! Justification is not forensic, nor is it attained *sola fide*! But while Protestant orthodoxy is not pure Paulinism, it is very much nearer the mind of the apostle than this sort of utterance regarding faith (p. 329): "It is because man is convinced that God has manifested His grace and pardon in Christ and justifies those who are united to Christ, that he submits to the gospel and wishes to participate in the atoning effects of the Redemption through the reception of Baptism."

As a compend of Roman Catholic opinions the book may be of some use. It contains little that is trustworthy regarding St. Paul.

There are two Doctors Cadoux, both of them distinguished

Congregationalist ministers and both active in theological discussion. Dr. A. T. Cadoux has done his best to obviate confusion by dedicating the present volume (partly to another friend but primarily) to his brother, the Professor.

In turning from Father Bandas to Dr. Cadoux, one finds oneself at the opposite pole of theology. There are indeed similarities. If the Roman Catholic author reads Paul in the light of Church dogma, Dr. Cadoux reads Paul—and the New Testament generally—in the light of his own pure but somewhat thin ethical rationalism. The teaching of the Master, of course, is at a further remove from formulated doctrine than the teaching of the apostles ; and, once he has belittled and thrust aside the eschatological framework of the thought of John and Jesus, Dr. Cadoux finds it comparatively easy to reduce the words of Christ within the limits of his own creed. The epistles create more difficulty, but even with them he finds a way. A steadily minimizing interpretation drops (say) some twenty or twenty-five per cent. of the apparent meaning of the writers ; about the same amount is further written off as due to inherited prejudices, chiefly Jewish ; prejudices from which modern Christianity is thought to be emerging. The remainder, Dr. Cadoux finds himself able to accept. Penal views of the atonement are a subordinate part of Dr. Bandas's load of doctrine ; they meet with flat rejection from Dr. Cadoux. The latter gains much of his power as a critic of doctrine by skilfully tying down theological tradition to the penal view in its narrowest form. In general, the paradoxes of Paulinism—those paradoxes which enshrine so glorious an inheritance of spiritual truth—fare badly with both writers.

It is quite possible that we must advance beyond exegesis or formulated expressions of biblical theology, if we are to serve the Christian mind of to-day. Probably the best and most suggestive part of Dr. Cadoux's volume is found in chapter iii (" Experience ") and chapter iv (" Validity "), where he outlines a spiritual philosophy and ethic as a help to the understanding of the Christian message. Such a thesis as " Jesus makes explicit what is implicit in the moral consciousness," is, I incline to think, of great value ; and the criticism of psycho-analytic determinism is powerfully stated. Ethical interests, which were so far to seek among Dr. Bandas's dogmas, are here triumphant. There

is a suggestion of Ritschl and Herrmann—let us observe, e.g., the praise given to the absoluteness of Kant's ethics. Possibly there is an even closer approach to the neo-Fichtean philosophies. For the speculative element is not excluded from Dr. Cadoux's theology, but included—though always with full consciousness that ethical insight goes deeper. Is not such an ethical appeal wise and right? Christianity has always addressed the conscience, and must do so more than ever now, and more directly.

But then, are the ethical instincts of the modern mind, as seen even in Dr. Cadoux, adequately deep? One fears there is a worm at the root of his fine moral enthusiasm. He tells us that the old doctrine of Atonement has lost its power of appeal with the disappearance of belief in endless punishment. More than that, however, is disappearing—belief in punishment itself. If the latter belief should revive—as, please God, it will; though it may be quite impossible for us to believe again in endless, hopeless pain—then sin may once more be viewed with due seriousness, and the message of mercy may be recognized once more as wonderful. For punishment is a witness to a thing greater than itself, to guilt. Where do we read of guilt in Dr. Cadoux's pages? Where does the modern mind—the mind of the passing hour—show itself acquainted with that grim and tremendous reality? Punishment then is a witness to the guilt of sin; but the remedy for sin is something diviner; not law but grace; forgiveness. Or, more fully, the remedy is redemption. Most simply, but best of all, the remedy is Christ. Moral indifference towards guilt—Socialist, Pacifist, Hedonist; humanitarian, but not godly—will never learn even the alphabet of Christian faith.

A third feature of Dr. Cadoux's ethical basis is its claim to exclusive validity. If our Lord should dare to "confirm the word with signs following," He would be destroying the purity of His appeal. Miracles must go. They are irreligious. Again, intellectual grounds for belief can never rise above probability. (That is another knotty point, but quite possibly Dr. Cadoux is right in his decision of it.) And probable arguments in corroboration of faith are, in the nature of things, illegitimate. At this juncture Dr. Cadoux becomes inconsistent with himself. In his admiration for science and for the majestic generalization which proclaims evolution as almost or quite absolute truth in our

interpretation of the universe, Dr. Cadoux admits scientific probabilities in corroboration of faith (p. 175). Here again I incline to think that he is right; but the concession appears to me to unpick a good deal of the fabric which he has been weaving. *Per contra*, if space permitted, it might be possible to show that Dr. Cadoux cannot fairly attach so much weight to evolution as his words seem to assert, and even that his own inner mind follows a different course. But space forbids.

The doctrine of the Atonement submitted to us is a mixture of the Moral Influence theory with the doctrine of Divine suffering. The author seems—if I understand him rightly—to impart sharper definiteness to the latter by bringing it into close connexion with the tragedy of the Cross. Apparently God, as well as Jesus, had hoped for better things. And, when Jesus' heart broke and killed Him, God's heart broke too. And the proclamation of this heart-broken but still loving Father, this heart-broken but still loving Saviour, turns out to be the supreme and victorious appeal which redeems mankind. The disappointment, the tragedy, the failure, is the final victory. But how, pray, do we know that love survives? (We are forbidden, under the severest penalties, to mention the Resurrection.) And further: unless the revelation of God's loving purpose is equally a revelation of holiness and righteousness, God's love sinks to mere good-nature tainted with moral indifference. There is no glory in such a Cross.

The sweep of Dr. Cadoux's restatement extends further still. Jesus is strictly a mere man, though he may be called God in some poetical sense. And the author again assures us that this new tremendous negation is religiously inevitable. Restatement at any rate may be inevitable; I believe with all my heart that it is. But not genius, nor even saintliness, could satisfactorily restate our faith in 244 small octavo pages. What is to survive? To find Jesus indispensable to our souls and to find Him all-sufficient is to stand upon the platform of Christianity. In his own way Dr. Cadoux shares this grand confession, though his intellectual version of Christianity appears to be an extraordinarily precarious thing. One would expect him, in a few years' time, to admit much more than now, or else to assert much less.

What a relief it is to soul and conscience to turn back to the old simple utterances vetoed—most vainly vetoed—by modern enlightenment!—

O wondrous love, to bleed and die,
To bear the cross and shame,
That guilty sinners such as I
Might plead Thy gracious name!

"It pleased God by the foolish thing we preach to save them that believe. We preach Christ crucified."

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

* * * * *

Christianity and World-Problems. By the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. x, 211. 6*s*.

Certain qualities of mind and heart are demanded of the Christian apologist. He must be in touch with the mind of his age, or he will be fighting with shadows. He must be fair to his opponents, else he will irritate instead of convincing them. He must have a firm and reasoned faith in the Christian Revelation. Above all he must have charity.

Dr. Orchard has many of these qualities. He has an instinctive knowledge of the religious perplexities of the modern mind. Elsewhere he has dealt with problems which belong to the sphere of theology and of Biblical criticism. Here he deals with World-Problems which perplex the minds of many who have little interest either in criticism or in doctrine. Popular science has unsettled the minds of many Christians. There are those who are troubled by the thought of the vastness of the universe, in which man appears to occupy a place far less important than that which the Christian Revelation assigns to him. There are those to whom anthropology, with its teaching of the enormous antiquity of man, seems to reduce Christianity to a mere ripple on the surface of an ever-rolling stream. There are those who, like Little Emmy in Tennyson's poem, find it difficult to believe in God's care for the individual when there are "So many beds in the ward." There are those whose study of the science of Comparative Religion has made them doubt the absoluteness of the Christian Religion. It is for such that this book is written. And, since the problems which confront our age are practical as well as theoretical, Dr. Orchard also wisely devotes chapters to the consideration of such topics as Church and State, the Clash of Colour, Social Unrest and World Peace.

Further Dr. Orchard always states his opponents' case fairly, never more fairly than when, as in dealing with the arguments in

favour of war, he most disagrees with it. He has a remarkable gift for sponging up miscellaneous information, and presenting it in a popular form. The opening paragraphs of the chapter on "Christ and the Universe" might have been written by an astronomer, and the same easy mastery of his subject is evident throughout the book. Sometimes, of course, Homer nods. Whence did he get the information that "disease is almost entirely a civilized thing: primitive people suffered very little from disease"? Certainly not from missionaries, who could tell of African tribes decimated by the ravages of disease.

Again Dr. Orchard has an encouraging and infectious faith in the power of the Christian Revelation to meet both the theoretical and the practical problems of our age. Dr. Orchard has his own idea of what that Revelation is. He is a Catholic and his Catholicism is peculiar to himself. Sometimes his theology is Roman. "There is room for almost infinite grades of conscious happiness, extending from the highest saint, the Blessed Virgin herself, the chief glory of our redeemed humanity, down through every degree of sanctity." And Dr. Orchard would like the Vatican to "have a strip of neutral territory, preferably open to the sea, so that in time of war the Roman Church could keep up its world connections." But then Dr. Orchard does not like the attitude of the Vatican to socialism, nor its toleration of war. Is he then a modernist? He accepts the results of modern criticism, but:—"No doctrine can ever find its way to Christian acceptance unless it can be authoritatively shown that no relevant text is contrary to it." What then is this neo-Catholicism which is to solve those world-problems which are the despair of the present Churches? Dr. Orchard does not tell us, and we are still in the dark.

We do not expect a publicist like Dr. Orchard to wear his heart upon his sleeve, but we could wish that the note of charity had been more prominent in these discussions. Our age no doubt requires to think more clearly, but it needs also sympathy in the dark hours of its doubt. That sympathy Dr. Orchard no doubt feels. We wish that he had given it a warmer expression.

It is one of the stimulating qualities of Dr. Orchard's work that it always provokes criticism, and we note one or two passages with which we are unable to agree.

In the Chapter on "Christ and the Universe" it is suggested

that "we may come back to the simple belief that the universe is of the size and grandeur that it is in order to convey to man adequate conceptions of the Creator. This must not be dismissed as impossible, for it would be difficult to discern a worthier purpose than for God to awaken man to the knowledge of Himself." This is anthropocentricity with a vengeance! We agree, of course, that the Redemption of man was a more wonderful act than the Creation of the starry heavens. But, somehow, we cannot flatter ourselves into thinking that God created the universe with the sole purpose of impressing us with His majesty.

Here again are paradoxes which contain only half truths. The present industrial system is "one of the results of the Reformation, and the logical outcome of the individualism which it fostered." The statement has just that admixture of truth and falsehood which make it plausible. It has already been answered by Dr. Coulton and others. "Christianity is fast becoming the last and the only sanction for war." Even in its context this remark is paradoxical. And what of this argument against birth-control?:—"According to the Christian doctrine it is obvious that the more souls that can be created the better; it means making heaven populous."

But Dr. Orchard is, after all, a prophet rather than an apologist, and the prophets have often revelled in paradox, and in seeing visions which they do not hope to see realized. With the prophets Dr. Orchard believes that "the Church is best when inspirational rather than institutional," and it is his mission to inspire rather than to defend the Church. Dr. Orchard's visions of a Church which shall supersede the state and of a world in which there shall be neither war nor want may seem, as he confesses, hopelessly idealistic, yet it is by dreams that men live.

D. W. GREENFIELD.

* * * * *

The Greek Point of View. By Maurice Hutton, Principal of University College, Toronto, and Professor of Greek, sometime Scholar of Worcester College and Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. 207. Price 7*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Hutton has given us a fascinating book, interesting, and perhaps provocative to scholars—for Mr. Hutton is not always orthodox—illuminating to those whose classics are rusty, but who

wish to understand the mind of the race which was intellectually the mother of us all.

In a pathetic little preface the author tells us that the writing of the book was interrupted by "sickness and other realities of life. When the sickness ended I had leisure to return to the moonlight mists and mirages of literature where values are distorted and often transposed; for . . . the painful student who has laboured at the art of expression for a life-time has nothing to express: the man who has a life and a story to tell has never acquired the art of expression." These words strike the keynote of the book, for its author is more interested in life than in letters, in conduct than in art. Thus, while appreciating the peculiar merits of the Greek genius—its clarity of expression and love of logical thought, its sense of proportion and love of colour—Mr. Hutton is more conscious than most Hellenists of its defects. To him—as to Browning in the mood of the "Statue and the Bust," though not of Rabbi Ben Ezra—it appears a sin that "the Greek does not want to commit himself by action." The Greeks lived too much in the "moonlight mists and mirages of literature," and like their spiritual descendants the French, excelled in the art of saying nothing gracefully. Their love of logic led them to distrust those instincts which they could not explain, and so to find in self-interest the basis of all conduct.

Mr. Hutton is not only a man of action, he is also a Christian. Many of the great classic scholars have so acquired the pagan spirit that they seem unable to criticize it. The case of Gibbon is notorious, but Walter Pater furnishes another example. The exquisite picture of a Christian congregation in "Marius the Epicurean" is painted by a pagan who is trying to be just to Christianity. Jowett, sound Christian as he was, understood Plato better than he did S. Paul. It is possible that Mr. Hutton also knows the classics better than the Scriptures, but, fortunately, he does not regard them as superior. It may be true that, as Dean Inge is so fond of insisting, it was a Hellenized Christianity which conquered the world, but it is also true that it is only from the vantage-ground which Christianity has gained for us that we are able to see the defects of Hellenism.

Apologists for Christianity make a good deal of the lower sex-morality of the Greeks, and point to slavery as a pagan system which Christianity has abolished. Such arguments have

little value. The sex-morality of the Christians was Jewish. The early Christians, as Mr. Hutton reminds us, did not condemn slavery, which indeed arose as a humane alternative to butchery of the captives of war. Mr. Hutton is indeed in error if he accepts the old argument which he quotes without comment that "S. Paul sent back Onesimus to his master to be a good slave again." Has he forgotten the apostle's words "Not now as a servant, but above a servant a brother beloved"? He is right, however, in insisting that there are other and more fundamental differences between the Greek and the Christian points of view.

For one thing the Greek standpoint is *intellectual*, while the Christian emphasis is upon the *will*. We suspect that Mr. Hutton takes too seriously the surely ironic argument of the Platonic Socrates that "virtue is knowledge." All attempts to rationalize ethics lead to paradoxes such as this, but in his more serious thinking Plato does not identify virtue with knowledge but makes such moral instincts in the sense of justice the very basis of his ethics. Still it is true that a Greek would never have written, "Though I have all knowledge, and have not charity, I am nothing." Christianity is, indeed, to the Greeks foolishness. It is doubtful if it can ever be completely rationalized. The attempts of Seely and Dr. Hastings Rashdall to pour the new wine of Christianity into the old bottles of Hellenism have been singularly unsuccessful. If you try to transform the teaching of Jesus into an ethical system you take away its salt and its savour.

Again there is a deep gulf fixed between the Greek and the Christian conception of immortality. It is not only that what to the Greek was, at best, a pious hope is to the Christian a glorious assurance. The hesitating peradventures of the *Phædo* are, indeed, very different from the passionate assertions of 1 Corinthians xv. There is a difference of belief as well as of intensity of belief. "The immortality of the soul upon which Plato insists is not the immortality of the Christian Churches, but is as far from it almost, as it can well be." "Platonic immortality is much more oriental than Western, and more Buddhist than Christian." To us immortality means the survival of our personality after death. In Newman's phrase, "You will still be you." With Plato that which we call personality is washed away in the waters of Lethe; though in certain cases there may be reminiscences of the soul's previous states of existence.

That which survives is the eternal reason, the "thinking upon thought," "just the spark of electric fluid so to speak which kindles and in turn burns out a hundred successive brief candles, and passes on in due time to animate another." Not that Plato is altogether consistent in his doctrine. In Oxford slang "You can find any old thing in Plato," and millenarians and believers in the Last Judgment may find support in his writings. Still, in spite of the great influence of Origen and Tertullian who gave a Platonic form to the Christian doctrine, the Greek and the Christian expectations regarding the life after death stand at poles apart.

Lastly, it may not be irreverent to put the greatest of the Greeks beside the Master in order to illustrate the radical difference between Hellenism and Christianity. "Socrates cared only for the intellect and intelligence of his disciples; and the first necessity for the intellect is free thought and independence of mind; Socrates therefore eschewed the very principle of authority upon which Christ built. His disciples were to believe nothing because he said it, do nothing because he did it; it was not a society, a church, a way of life, which he wished to found; it was not a conversion of character which he desired; he wished only to develop and popularize free and careful thinking."

There is a useful, but incomplete, index.

D. W. Greenfield.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Mr. Paul Goodman has written a short, interesting life of *Sir Moses Montefiore* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America), which tells the story of this remarkable Jewish financier and philanthropist. He was a noble representative of Judaism in Victorian England, won honour and respect outside his own religion, and did notable service for his oppressed fellow-religionists abroad. Mr. Goodman tells us that "his attachment to the Holy Land induced him to put on for the sabbath-day a ring engraved with the word 'Jerusalem,' and to keep under his pillow a stone from Jerusalem bearing the inscription: 'For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof' (Ps. cii. 14)." There is a curious item in his

diary for 1820, which illustrates his character and piety. "With God's blessing—Rise, say prayers at 7 o'clock. Breakfast at 9. Attend the Stock Exchange, if in London, at 10. Dinner 5. Read, write, and learn, if possible, Hebrew and French, 6. Read Bible and say prayers, 10. Then retire." The book is an admiring record of one who was a dignified, unselfish leader of Judaism in Victorian England.

* * * * *

Mr. G. A. Gaskell's *Genesis Interpreted* (C. W. Daniel Co., 3*s.* 6*d.*) expounds the first nine chapters by means of what is called "a knowledge of the one universal symbolic language in which the sacred scriptures of all nations are expressed." The book of Genesis has problems, but they are crystal clear in comparison with Mr. Gaskell's interpretation of the text. Thus i. 27 reads: "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." The symbolic meaning apparently is: "And the Divine Will caused to be created through complete involution the Archetypal Man, being in the image (microcosm) of the Divine fulness (macrocosm), as a dual expression of Truth-Wisdom (Atmabuddhi) on the higher mental plane." And there we may leave it.

* * * * *

Six earnest religious addresses are collected in *The Collapse of Christianity and other Sermons* (Arthur H. Stockwell) by the Rev. Joseph Miller. The sermon which gives its title to the small book is upon the text in Luke xviii. 8, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" It is a sensible utterance, but one ought not to say that before the Great War "Protestant Germany, in general, the legacy of Martin Luther, had no place for Christ."

* * * * *

A committee of the Society for Old Testament Study has issued *A Scripture Bibliography* (Nisbet: 6*d.*), for the use of teachers in secondary schools and for Bible students. It gives an annotated list of the best English books on the Bible, which will be found of great service. The dates and prices of the volumes are given, with brief indication of their value and outlook. Information on such points is being constantly demanded, and everyone interested in biblical study should procure a copy of this excellent pamphlet.

CURRENT ISSUES.

THE series of articles by Canon Battersby Harford, which closes in this number, has been a real contribution to the subject of Old Testament criticism. I am personally grateful to him for having undertaken the task, and I know, from correspondence, that he has presented many readers with exactly the information they required. The movements of criticism in this department are so vigorous, that it seemed to me a critical survey was needed, and the Canon has drawn this accurately as well as freshly. We are all in his debt.

* * * * *

In the biography of *Sir William Robertson Nicoll*, which Dr. Darlow has just published, there is an account of how the EXPOSITOR was taken over by that remarkable editor in 1885. Dr. Darlow notes how month by month, under his editorship, "the magazine continued to present 'the best thoughts of the best men on the best of books.'" And now, forty years later, I have to announce that this is the last number. The circulation has indeed risen, during the past two years, but not sufficiently to make it a financial success. Evidently the strain of conditions in the modern ministry renders it impossible for clergymen and ministers to subscribe, as once they were able to do, to a monthly magazine of this kind. Hence the publishers have decided to discontinue it.

* * * * *

I desire to thank very heartily those who have written to me during these years with appreciation and suggestions. The EXPOSITOR has reached far and near, and I have been deeply interested to correspond with students of the Bible in this and other lands, who have been reading the magazine.

* * * * *

However, although the EXPOSITOR must cease, in its monthly form, we propose to issue next spring the first number of "The

Expositor's Year-book." This is a new venture. The idea is to present a survey of the best work done during the previous year, i.e. theological work, primarily connected with the Bible. No survey of this kind is accessible in English, and it is hoped that the "Year-book" will have permanent value for students and readers of the Bible.

* * * * *

There will be surveys of Old Testament and New Testament criticism, and also of theological literature, during 1925, with information about publishers and prices. There will also be a survey of all the important articles on the exegesis and interpretation of the Bible, in English and foreign periodicals. My aim is to provide for the student, and also for the preacher, who takes his work with any seriousness. Thus I hope to add a special section upon general allusions to the Bible in the literature and history of 1925. In this way, the "Year-book" will provide an accessible and reliable guide to whatever of value has been written, during the past twelve months, upon the subject.

* * * * *

As the years go on, I hope to make the "Year-book" more and more adequate. But already I have been able to secure the aid of several well-known scholars, to co-operate in the first volume, including the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D.D., and the Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D., who will share the Old Testament survey between them. It is hoped that those who have subscribed to the EXPOSITOR will continue their support to its successor in this annual form. The "Year-book" will be issued in spring, by the present publishers, at a moderate price, and in editing it, I repeat, I shall endeavour to make it as complete and accurate as possible for those who, in any way, take an intelligent interest in the modern interpretation of the Bible, and who desire to be abreast of what is being done, over the world, to explain and apply the Scriptures.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

C. The nature and date of the Priestly Code.
The third main position of the regnant hypothesis.
Has it 'suffered severely' at the hands of recent critics ?
I. What is 'the Priestly Code' ? Its *primâ facie* meaning.
II. The modern view. Two illustrations, 'tent' and 'ark.'
III. In defence of Mosaic authorship. Orr, Wiener. The problem of the priests and Levites.
IV. Criticism of the modern view on three lines. Welch.
1. Is the theory based on a sound historical foundation ?
i. A preliminary caveat.
ii. Charge of 'ignoring history.'
iii. Prof. Torrey and Prof. Batten.
iv. Conclusion.
2. Did P ever have an independent existence ?
i. If it did, why combined with older documents ?
ii. Can this 'mere skeleton' ever have stood alone ?
(*a*) The supplementary theory. Orr, Dahse.
(*b*) The Fragmentary theory. Max Löhr.
Criticism of these theories. Skinner, Sellin.
iii. Is its spirit and outlook uniformly narrow and legalistic ?
3. Can P's legal code be regarded as post-exilic ?
i. Is it uniform, or the result of a long development ?
ii. When did the development take place ?
iii. The Relation of prophecy and law.
iv. Conclusion.

Article 5. The Problem of the Priestly Code.

"The third main position of the modern view" of the Old Testament, wrote Prof. Welch in May 1923, is that "a definite system of legislation called the Priestly Code was adopted by the post-exilic community at the bidding of its leader Ezra in an hour of religious and political enthusiasm. The code, then introduced and bound upon the community, marked the entry or, if not the entry, the dominance of a new legalistic spirit, which in turn produced a literature that recast the history of Israel and revised its institutions. Thus the Priestly Code is far more than a handbook: it contains, e.g., a revision of the early tales

in Genesis and especially of the incidents at Sinai. This position is the Achilles' heel of the theory, and here, more than anywhere else, it has suffered heavily." * It is the purpose of this Article to examine and weigh the evidence adduced in proof of this statement.

I. In order to discuss intelligently the questions raised, we must first have a clear grasp of what is meant by the Priestly Code.

In Articles 1 and 2 (July, pp. 8–15; Aug., pp. 85–88) we saw that the dominant hypothesis had found in the first four books of the Pentateuch three documentary strata which had been woven together into one. One of these, generally referred to as P, contained a series of appearances to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai, used Elohim where another document would have used Yahweh, and was marked by a distinctive style and phraseology and by other characteristic differentiæ.

There is no dispute as to the existence of this stratum. "The sections ordinarily attributed to P," writes Orr, "have a vocabulary and a stylistic character of their own, which render them in the main readily distinguishable." † If we take a copy of the R.V. and mark in red ink every occurrence of the 50 words and phrases included in the list given by Driver in his *Introduction* (Ed.[6] pp. 130–135, Ed.[1] pp. 123–128), we find that certain sections of the Pentateuch are besprinkled with these characteristic words and phrases, while other sections are quite free from them.‡ When we

* Expositor, May 1923, pp. 359 and 345–346.

† *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 335, and see pp. 197, 340, etc. Compare Sellin's *Introduction*, p. 81. ("The portions of the Pentateuch which belong to the Priestly Writing stand out with peculiar distinctness from the remaining material, so that even the non-expert can recognize them without difficulty.")

‡ A much fuller list will be found in Carpenter and Harford's *Hexateuch*, Ed.[1], vol. i., pp. 208–221. N.B.—The explanatory introduction to the lists on pp. 183–184 should be carefully studied.

look at P, thus disentangled from the rest, we see that its central core is to be found in Exodus 25–31 and 35–40, the whole of Leviticus, Numbers 1–10, 13–20 in the main, 25–36 almost entirely. Its distinguishing characteristics are seen to be a detailed description of the Tabernacle and a series of ceremonial and legal regulations, dealing with the proper way of worshipping Yahweh and of securing the ceremonial purity of his people. This central core is placed in a framework of history, stretching from the Creation to the death of Moses, but for the most part the thread of the narrative is extremely thin and often serves merely to carry on the Chronology. It becomes fuller however when special interests come into play, as, e.g., in Genesis with regard to the three preludes to the Mosaic covenant connected with the names of Adam, Noah and Abraham.* Finally in Joshua, after a brief account of the Crossing of Jordan, the Passover and probably the stories of Achan and the Gibeonites (of which only fragments are left), P provides an account of the settlement of the Tribes in Palestine (13^{15}–22^{34} with slight exceptions). The legislative portion of this stratum, as Wellhausen said long ago, "preponderates over the rest of the legislation in force as well as in bulk. . . ." In the Pentateuch it "makes no reference to later times and settled life in Palestine and keeps strictly within the limits of the situation in the wilderness." It is very natural therefore that upon this great section have been based in the past "our conceptions of the Mosaic theocracy, with the Tabernacle as its centre, the high priest as its head, the priests and Levites as its organs, the legitimate cultus as its regular function." †

* For more adequate statement see Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 6–9; Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch* Ed.[1], vol. i., xiii., pp. 121 ff. and 272–279; Sellin, *Introduction*, pp. 81–82; Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. lvii.–lix.; Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 126–128 and 159.

† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 8–9.

II. It was only after long controversy and the labours of many scholars that this conception was abandoned as not strictly historical and another established in its place. Prof. Welch himself accepts this later conception as true to history. "It is well known," he says, "that the School which came to control the religious life of Judaism after the Exile was not content to insist on the centralisation of worship as an essential feature in their religion and on the Aaronic priesthood as the true Apostolic succession. They also taught that thus it had been from the beginning. What ultimately emerged in the course of historical development was regarded as having always been the rule and as possessing the authority of the first lawgiver." * In conformity with this conception the Priestly writers rewrote both the history and the law. For examples, we may note their treatment of the Tent and the ark. (i.) JE tells us how Moses pitched 'the tent of meeting' † afar off from the camp. There he met God, Who came down in a pillar of cloud and spake with him face to face. Everyone who sought the LORD went out to this tent. In none of these passages is anything said about priests or altar or sacrifice, but this may be due to an Editor. Joshua is the custodian of the tent in the absence of Moses. Deuteronomy has no reference to this tent at all, apart from the passage from E in chap. 31. Outside P and Chronicles 'the tent of meeting' is only mentioned again in 1 Sa. 2^{22b} and 1 Ki. 8^{4} (= 2 Chr. 5^{5}), both of which passage shew marks of

* Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 175–176, cp. p. 205. "Israel became a Church," etc.

† E 6 times (Ex. 33^{7}, Nu. 11^{16}, 12^{4}, Deut. 31^{14}), 13 times 'the Tent' alone (Ex. 33^{8-11}, Nu. $11^{24, 26}$, $12^{5, 10}$, Dt. 31^{15}). Moffatt translates: 'the Trysting tent.' Welch speaks of "the early institutions of the tent of witness and the ark," but regards them as Palestinian and only in later days "derived from Moses and carried back to the period of Sinai." He uses the title 'tent of witness' (rather 'of the testimony'), but this is not early, occurring only in P (4 times in Nu.) and once in 2 Chr. 24^{6}. Compare 'the Dwelling of the testimony' in P only (Ex., Nu. 5 times).

later insertion. But when we turn to P, we find 'the tent of meeting' referred to 131 times.* P places it in the centre of the camp and the Levites camp around it in their thousands. Within the tent he places 'the Dwelling' (A.V. Tabernacle),† made of portable boards and lined with rich hangings, and therein take place the solemn sacrifices and ritual of the Priestly Law. (ii.) The ark in JE goes before the host, when on the march (Nu. 10^{33-36}, Josh. $3^{6.\ 11.\ 14}$, 4^{7}). According to Deuteronomy (10^{1-5}) Moses at the divine command makes an Ark before, for the second time, ascending Mt. Horeb to receive two tables of stone, and on his descent he places the tables therein. In all probability JE, which Deuteronomy habitually follows, originally contained an account of the making of the ark, this being omitted, when P's account was added. In P the ark is made at a later date (Ex. 37^{1-9}) by Bezalel; it is kept in the Holy of holies and, when on the march, is carried by the Levites in the midst of the host, six tribes preceding and six following it.

There are but two examples of the numerous phenomena, which are found, when P is compared with JE and D. In the light of these the modern view, which regards P as a rewriting of early history and law in accordance with the usage and ideas of the post-exilic age, has won very general acceptance from scholars in every land, but it has in its turn met with vigorous criticism from the right and the left wings.

III. There are those who still maintain, in some shape or form, the Mosaic authorship.‡ Within the limits of a

* Including Josh. 18^{1}, 19^{51}.

† P 101 times. Chron. 8 times—only again (in sing.) literally in 2 Sa. 7^{6} = 1 Chr. 17^{5} (probably a gloss); never in J, E or D. (It is used *metaphorically* of Temple or House of God, Ezek. 37^{27}, Pss. 26^{8}, 74^{7} and in plural 43^{3}, 46^{4}, etc.)

‡ Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, pp. [285–377; Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, *Pentateuchal Studies*, etc., etc.

single article it is only possible to give one sample of the arguments by which they seek to make good their position. Wellhausen spoke of "the position of the Levites" as "the Achilles heel of the Priestly Code." * If, i.e., the modern theory is here proved to be wrong, then its days are numbered. First then let us see what are the Biblical data, then let us compare the solutions.

1. The Biblical data are these. (i) In P (Ex.–Nu.) we find two orders of Ministrants, sharply divided the one from the other. Aaron and his sons (Lev. 8–10, Nu. 3^{1-4}) are consecrated to be priests, performing all ritual and service within the Sanctuary and blessing the people; they alone may touch the holy things. The tribe of Levi are then (Nu. 3^{5}–4, 18^{1-7}) given to Aaron. There are 22,000 † males of a month old and upward, of whom 8,580 are between 30 and 50 years of age. These latter carry the Dwelling and its holy contents when on journeys and camp round the sacred Tent when it is at rest. The holy things must be covered up by the priests, before the Levites come in to carry them, lest they die. The Levites are given the tithe (Nu. 18^{21-24}) and forty-eight cities (Nu. 35^{1-8}, a command given 'in the plains of Moab'). ii. In Deuteronomy all is changed. There is one order only, 'the Levitical priests' ($17^{9, 18}$, etc.); ‡ gulf between priests and Levites there is none. "Deuteronomy knows no Levites who cannot be priests and no priests who are not Levites." § 'Moses' in 10^{8} says: "at that time [either at Jotbathah after the death of Aaron, or more

* *Prolegomena*, p. 167.

† Wiener, not unnaturally from his point of view, regards this number as 'corrupt.'

‡ 'the Priests the Levites' $17^{9, 18}$, 18^{1}, 24^{8}, 27^{9}, Josh. 3^{3r}, 8^{33}; 'the sons of Levi' 21^{5}, 31^{9}; 'the priest(s)' 17^{12}, 18^{3}, 19^{17}, 20^{2}, 26^{3}, Josh. $4^{3r, 9}$; 'the tribe of Levi' 10^{8}, 18^{1}; Josh. 13^{14}; 'the Levite that is within your gates' $12^{12, 18}$, 14^{27}, $16^{11, 14}$, cp. 26^{11}; 'the Levite' 12^{19}, 14^{29}, 18^{6} (Heb.), $26^{12, 13}$; 'the Levites' 27^{14}, 31^{25} (r=redactor).

§ W. Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, Ed.², p. 360.

probably at Horeb, [6-7] being a later insertion] Yahweh separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, to stand before Yahweh to minister unto Him and to bless in His name unto this day" (cp. 21^5 with its additional words). These are priestly functions. There is no hint that this is revolutionary. On the contrary it has been so from the beginning of their ministry 'unto this day.' The Levite now "has no inheritance" (19^9, etc.), but, like the stranger and the widow, dwells on other people's land and is an object for charitable consideration (12^{12}, etc.). iii. The historical and prophetical books in their genuine writings know nothing of the distinction between priest and Levite. The apparent exceptions in Joshua all occur in the long section (13^{15}–22^{34}) which is almost entirely from the hand of P. In Judges 17–20 we read stories of two wandering Levites, one of whom is said to be a grandson of Moses and is consecrated by Micah (!) to be his priest in his private shrine. In Samuel and Kings there are only three references to Levites (1 Sam. 6^{15}, 2 Sam. 15^{24}, 1 Kings 8^4) and all three for one reason or another are suspect. Isa. 66^{21}, Jer. 33^{18-22}, Mal. $2^{4.8.}$ 3^3, Ps. 135^{20} (Zech. 12^{13}) are the only references in psalm or prophecy (Ezekiel excepted) to Levites or to the house or tribe of Levi. They breathe the same atmosphere as Deuteronomy. (iv) Ezekiel has 8 references to 'the Levites' in 40–48. Here we again come upon a clear division of 'the sons of Levi' (40^{46}) into two Orders, but upon totally different grounds; the Zadokite Levites of Jerusalem are alone to be priests in the renovated Temple, the country Levites are to be degraded because of their idolatry; they are no longer to be priests, but are to perform the lesser duties which have for too long been performed in Jerusalem by uncircumcized temple-slaves (44^{6-16}). (v) Finally, in Chronicles Ezra and Nehemiah we find the two Orders actually ministering in the second

Temple side by side. The Levites are mentioned 161 times and the priests 175 times. This is evidently regarded as the normal and only legal state of things.

How are these phenomena to be explained ?

Orr * acknowledges frankly that, when one passes from Numbers to Deuteronomy, " the difference in point of view and mode of speech must be apparent to every reader ; and," he goes on to say, " it may at once be conceded . . . that if we had only Deuteronomy, we should never be able to arrive at a knowledge of the sharp division of the tribe of Levi into the superior and subordinate Orders with which the Levitical law makes us acquainted." Writing on Deuteronomy, he does his best to get round the differences in phraseology and in the whole conception of the Levites' duties and status, and to shew that in spite of all appearance to the contrary the two orders still existed as they are depicted in Numbers, but his arguments remind one of the proverbial drowning man catching at straws.

Wiener † also desires to maintain the Mosaic authorship, but he rejects Orr's position as impossible, and proposes another. P, he says, is legislation for the wilderness. As soon as the wanderings are over, the tribe of Levi will no longer be needed to carry the Dwelling and its holy things, and on the other hand some of the priestly duties will require a numerous body of priests, scattered over the land. The one family of Aaron could not possibly perform them. Moses therefore, on the plains of Moab, reverses the whole scheme and the whole tribe of Levi are advanced to priestly status. From Moses to Malachi every writer who touches on the subject recognizes this Levitical priesthood. Moreover the Order of Aaron dies out with Abiathar, and Zadok

* *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 185 and the whole section, pp. 184–192.

† *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 231–286.

by royal order takes his place. During the Exile Ezekiel puts forward a plan for 'once more' dividing the Levitical priesthood into two classes. We find this division in full operation in the days of Nehemiah. Finally in Chronicles ('midrash' and not literal history) we find the religious life of the nation rewritten on the lines of P, as read in the light of the actual institutions of (say) 300 B.C.

The recognition by Wiener that the priesthood in Palestine was always Levitical from the crossing of Jordan until after Ezekiel is welcome, but when he asserts that the scheme of two Orders, as seen in Numbers, was only in force in the wilderness and that Moses silently cancelled it and substituted another on reaching the plains of Moab, he has to resort to desperate arguments to justify himself. 'True,' he says in effect, the Orders of Aaronic priests and of Levites were established as 'a Statute for ever' (Ex. 29^{9} and Nu. 18^{23}), but the phrase only means 'permanent for the time being' and the statute could be altered by lawgiver, prophet or even king at a moment's notice.* 'True,' no hint is given in Deuteronomy that so revolutionary a change is being effected and Moses (10^{8}) speaks as if the Levites had exercised priestly powers from the beginning but probably "something has fallen out from Exodus," † "or Numbers."

The solution accepted by the large majority of modern scholars avoids these difficulties. It sees in the earliest

* *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 243; *Early Hebrew History*, pp. 57 ff. Wiener quotes Ex. 12^{21-24} (a statute only observable at home), 23^{17} ('a few weeks later, necessitating absence from home'), Nu. 19^{6-14} (note 7 'offer an oblation'), and Dt. 16^{1-7} as offering "a brilliant illustration of the meaning of 'for ever' in legislation of this character and of the operation of the law of change . . . in the circumstances." It seems to me a brilliant illustration of how a clever man can circumvent the meaning of a phrase which doesn't fit in with his pet theory. 'A statute for ever' is only used in P (33 times in MT).

† *Studies*, p. 252, cp. pp. 243, 257.

sources primitive forms of worship and of priesthood, which prevailed for a long time. It was good to have a Levite for one's priest, but it was not essential (Judg. $17^{13.5}$). In the days of Josiah the growing conviction of the necessity of reform leads to action. The position of 'the priests the Levites' is strengthened and the worship centralized. Ezekiel, in his scheme for the renovated Temple, seeks reformation by confining the priesthood to the sons of Zadok and reducing the country Levites to an inferior position. We know that this was in full operation in the days of Nehemiah. Somewhere about 500 B.C. (?) a priestly writer (or school of writers), desiring to give fullest authority to this order of things, re-edits and rewrites Law and History. In all good faith and in accordance with oriental habit, he sets forth in the name of Moses the conception of the Orders of ministry which obtained in his own day. He bridges the gulf of centuries by asserting the perpetual obligation of these professedly Mosaic regulations as being 'statutes for ever throughout your generations.' Instead of presenting us with the puzzling problem of two periods, during which there ministered two sharply contrasted Orders of priests and Levites, separated by a gulf of many centuries during which this arrangement was ignored by everyone, this critical solution shews us good reasons for concluding that P's picture of the Mosaic theocracy is a reflection back into the distant past of the twofold, not to say threefold, ministry as it existed in the writer's own day. It relieves the religious leaders of the nation, in the past, from the charge of wilful neglect of the Mosaic ordinances, and presents P not as the foundation but as 'the headstone' of the Pentateuch.*

* This is only 'a sample,' and it suffers from the inevitable limitations of a sample. Students should (1) read the fuller argument in Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 121–151; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, pp. 358–362;

IV. We must now turn to those criticisms of the modern view which, in Welch's opinion, have really effected damaging blows. As presented by him, they raise three points, relating respectively to (1) P's historical basis, (2) its narrative, and (3) its code of laws.

1. Is the theory based on a sound historical foundation ? " Did the post-exilic community ever gather together and, after having read a detailed series of law, solemnly pledge themselves to observe this law as the basis of their new life in Jerusalem ? Is it even conceivable that such a thing was ever done ?

(i) This point, Welch says, is 'fundamental.' Is it ? The same initial criticism which we raised to Welch's statement of the problem of Deuteronomy applies to this also. The exact historical circumstances in which P came into force is not a fundamental issue. Even if the historicity of the description (Neh. 8) of the public reading of " the book of the law of Moses " and of the Covenant to keep it were successfully impugned, it would not affect the really fundamental position. This position is that P is later than Deuteronomy and is exilic or post-exilic, and this is based, not upon the historicity of Ezra, but upon quite other grounds, such as " the more advanced stage of ritual organization and hierarchical order " in comparison both with JE and D, its kinship with Ezekiel on the one hand and with Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah on the other, and its theological conceptions. *

(ii) Yet, while that is so, still it has been generally held, both by conservative and by liberal scholars, that the public reading of the law described in Nehemiah 8 was a real bit

Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. i., pp. 53, 76–77, 127–128 ; Driver, *Commentary on Deut.*, pp. 218–221, and (2) note that this is only one item in a closely related whole, which needs to be studied as a whole, if its cumulative force is to be adequately realized.

* See, e.g., Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 136–142.

of history. Welch, however, is very doubtful on the subject. "Ezra and Nehemiah," he says, "are the conclusion of the Book of Chronicles," and every statement in that book has been regarded by the critics as historically suspect. Yet this particular story they "accepted without question." They "built their theory on a basis which had not been tested," and "the further use of the historical principles, which produced the theory, has undermined its foundations. Torrey * believes himself justified in pronouncing that Ezra is not an historical person at all, but a creation of the Chronicler's imagination. And, while this conclusion may seem, and does seem to many, an extreme case of historical scepticism, the mere fact that it could be advanced by a serious student of history with a reputation to lose has underlined the fact that in this case historical criticism has ignored history." The charge here made of building on an untested foundation seems to me quite gratuitous.† The men who tested the statements of the Chronicler in the earlier part of his work were not the men to 'accept without question' his statement in the concluding section. It was a reasonable judgment which regarded the Chronicler's account of what happened after the Exile and possibly within a hundred years of the date of his writing,‡ as much more likely to be near to the historical facts than when he was writing of times centuries earlier and separated from him by the cataclysm of the Captivity. As for the inference drawn from "the mere fact" of Torrey's sceptical views about Ezra, would Welch regard it as legitimate

* C. C. Torrey, Professor at Yale, "Composition and Historical Value of Ezra–Nehemiah," *Z.A.W.*, Beiheft 2 (1896); *Ezra Studies*, University Press, Chicago (1910).

† Compare the similar charge as to the use of the MT, dealt with in Art. 2 (August, p. 166).

‡ Prof. Batten gives reasons for thinking that Ezra's date may have been 397 B.C. *I.C. Commentary on Ezra*, pp. 28–30.

argument to accuse the scholars, who have accepted as historical the main facts of the story of Christ, of having "ignored history" (whatever that may mean), because of 'the mere fact' that certain scholars in Holland and America have put forward similar sceptical views as to the historicity of our Lord?

iii. Torrey's arguments involve an entire rewriting of the history of the Jews during the Exile and after. The exiles of 597 and 586 B.C. were, he says, less than 5,000 (Jer. 52^{28-30}, but this is late and not in 2 Ki. 25). They settled down permanently in their new homes and, in any large numbers, never returned. They were not interested in a ritual law which could only take effect in Palestine. P was the product of many priests and of a long period, and all in Judæa. The whole of the Old Testament was written in Palestine, none in Babylonia. The exiles of whom the prophets are constantly speaking were the emigrants, who were continually streaming away from the unfertile land of their fathers and were forming colonies in Egypt and elsewhere. The Babylonian exiles were but a small part of 'the Dispersion' and are seldom mentioned separately except by pseudo-Jeremiah and the Chronicler. As for Ezra he is so precisely like the Chronicler himself in all his interests and principles, and his story is so clearly written in the phraseology of that writer, that we can only conclude that the latter is in fact his literary creator.*

All this is ably argued, but, as Prof. Batten † says, "Torrey's arguments have failed to convince those who have been diligent students of the story of Ezra." The reasons are sound which justify belief in the historical character of the man Ezra and in the existence of a personal

* *Ezra Studies*, pp. 238–248, 263, 285–297, etc.

† Prof. of the General Theological Seminary, New York, *I.C. Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, pp. 16–18, 51–52.

memoir by him, underlying 7^{27f}, 8^{15-34}, 9^{1-15}. No doubt Ezra's memoir "has been worked over a great deal and the numerous marks of the Chronicler are due to his revision," but plainly the Chronicler in these passages is using a source and "the passages in the first person are precisely those which raise no suspicion on the ground of credibility."

iv. But even if Ezra were not an historical personage, the fundamental position of the regnant hypothesis would remain unshaken. On this point I cannot do better than quote Welch himself: "it may be justly urged that what the Chronicler has done has been to concentrate into one dramatic act and to represent as the work of one man what was the work of a period and due to the activity of several actors. The fact may still remain that the Priest Code is the creation of the post-exilic community, when it reconstituted itself at Jerusalem. To ascribe the act to Ezra is merely to recognise that then the leadership did fall to the priesthood, and that the new code bears their impress in the subjects in which it is chiefly interested and in the spirit in which it rewrites all the past history of the Nation." *

In answer therefore to Welch's question quoted some pages back: "Is it even conceivable that such a thing was ever done?" we may say that, so far as we have gone, it seems not only conceivable, but rationally probable, that there was some occasion on which the post-exilic Community bound themselves to observe that which they believed to be in essence 'the law of Moses.' To deny its conceivability, as the question seems to invite us to do, is an example of 'extreme historical scepticism' which is not warranted by the facts as we know them.

2. The second point raised is: Did P ever form an independent writing? "The Priestly Code," Welch writes, "is said to present a history from the Creation, which

* Expositor, May 1923, pp. 360–361.

regards everything from the point of view of the origin in the world of Israel's peculiar religion principally as a cult and a law. This book once stood by itself, apart from the earlier accounts, J and E, but was finally amalgamated with these to form our present Pentateuch. Yet as soon as the book is separated from the others and regarded by itself, three questions at least urgently demand explanation and do not receive it." What are these three questions ?

i. The first question is : "If the writers meant their new book to be the official, orthodox account of Israel's past and place in the world, why did they combine it with documents which took a different attitude and which their story was presumably meant to replace ? " Welch gives as an example the story of the Flood. When they "rewrote" it, why did they "interweave" the new with the old and "make the old so integral a part of the new that it could not be superseded and die out ? "

The answer of course is that they did nothing of the kind. As Welch says : "The two accounts are so wholly different in their character that they are the most easily separated of all our duplicate narratives." * The writers of the later account undoubtedly meant to supersede the earlier documents. But, although they meant to do this, they did not succeed. Other and later writers took their story and interwove it with the old. And the explanation is not far to seek. "The spiritual insight of the Church judged more wisely than the learning of the Schools." † The piety of the Jewish people cherished all the materials connected with their early history. That these narratives were frequently contradictory, the one to the other, did not seriously trouble them. Their conception of history was different from ours. The same motive explains the amalgamation of the three

* Expositor, May 1923, p. 362.
† Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. lxvii.

main groups of laws in the Pentateuch. "Though much of the P code was really incompatible with the prior institutions, these were not set aside; they remained as precious monuments of the past." * This seems a very reasonable explanation of the actual fact of the interwoven narrative, and it seems strange that Welch should state that there is none forthcoming.

ii. The second urgent question propounded is based upon a quite reasonable expectation that "if the Priestly Code history was meant to stand alone, it should be able to do so." "No other account," writes Welch, ". . . can be so easily separated. . . . Yet, as soon as this is done . . . it becomes evident that it will not stand alone. It is a mere skeleton, which tumbles at once into a heap without the flesh and sinews which are only supplied by the other accounts. It becomes incredible that so bald a narrative ever stood alone."

This is a matter of opinion rather than of fact. It may seem incredible to Welch, but to others it does not seem at all incredible that the original Priestly writing could and did stand alone. It is obvious that no three documents covering the same ground could be completely preserved and used in a combined narrative. In regard to all three there must be certain omissions, amalgamations and probably transpositions. On the assumption that P was once an independent work, such processes have clearly gone on in the Pentateuch. In all probability, e.g., the birth of Esau and Jacob in P was omitted in favour of the prophecy in J and "in the stories of Jacob and Joseph the curt genealogical method could not be easily combined with the rich variety of JE and considerable rents were consequently caused in the continuity of P." † But when we have taken

* Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, Ed.[1], vol. i., p. 176.
† *Ibid.*, p. 177.

note of these rents in the fabric, it is at the same time remarkable how the P fragments and passages, 'pieced together' just as they are, do "form a consecutive history with few lacunæ." * Skinner has shewn this by printing "*the disjecta membra*" of P's epitome of the biography of Abraham, with no connections supplied and with only one verse transposed.

(*a*) An alternative theory put forward by Orr, which he adopted from Klostermann, is that the P verses and passages are the work of an Editor, who supplemented, or recapitulated, or set in a framework, the older narrative told in JE.† If readers will either study in Skinner's *Commentary*, or, better still, set down for themselves, the story of Abraham above mentioned (not, of course, writing out chapters 17 and 23) it may be safely left to them to decide "whether a narrative so continuous as this . . . is likely to have [resulted from putting together] the casual additions of a mere supplementer." * If further they will compare P's story of Creation and J's account of the beginnings of man (Gen. 1 and 2), the two Flood stories, and the two accounts of the covenant with Abraham (Gen. 15 and 17) they will see that it is a complete misnomer to speak of P's accounts as mere supplements or framework. They give quite different representations. "It is inconceivable that

* Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. lviii.–lix., cp. p. xli. The passages pieced together are 12^{4b-5}, $13^{6, 11b, 12a, b}$, 19^{29}, $16^{1, 3, 15f}$, 17, $21^{1b, 2b, 3-5}$, 23, 25^{7-11}. The thread is thin but continuous; in 17 and 23 it expands into full narrative.

† Dahse (Arts. 1 and 2) would have us see in many P verses and short sections liturgical glosses by which Ezra adapted the Pentateuch for public reading, but, as Sellin says, "Dahse's attempt to divide up the whole of the Priestly writing in this way breaks down in face of the long law-codes and lists, not to speak of many of the narrative portions," and to my mind Skinner has shewn with irresistible force that the theory equally breaks down as to the smaller sections. They are not mere recapitulations or headings, and more than half do not occur at the beginning or end of a Reading (see Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 192–228).

a supplementer should contradict his original at every turn and at the same time leave it to tell its own story." On the other hand, if P's narrative was intended to be an independent work and if eventually the Jewish community resolved to retain both old and new and wove them into one, the actual phenomena seem to be adequately explained. This explanation may not satisfy Welch, but he is hardly thereby justified in saying that no explanation is forthcoming.

(*b*) Another alternative is put forward by Prof. Max Löhr of Königsberg. Löhr * and Sellin † agree that Ezra was the author of the present Pentateuch, and that much of the material in the parts assigned to P was pre-exilic, some indeed as early as that in JE. But from this point they part company. Löhr is of opinion that there never was a continuous document 'P.' Ezra and his friends, he thinks, had at their disposal in Babylonia a large mass of written material of the most heterogeneous character, culled from various quarters, and from this Ezra selected what he wanted and worked it up into the present Pentateuch and brought it in its complete form to Jerusalem. This is a return to the 'Fragmentary theory' (see Article 1, July, pp. 12–13). He bases it upon supposed variations in the meaning of 'Generations' and seeming differences of point of view in such P narratives as Gen. 17 (which he divides into four separate sections), etc. These phenomena, so far as they really exist, do indeed reinforce the view already stated, viz. that P was itself to a large extent a compilation based upon written materials, and that these latter had themselves grown by accretion; but they prove nothing further. We must still hold with Sellin and most modern scholars that P "certainly now bears the impress of a single mind."

* Löhr, "Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis," *Z.A.W.*, Beiheft 38 (1924).

† Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, English Translation (1923), pp. 81–96.

Sellin thinks that this document was composed in Babylonia about 500 B.C. and that the narrative portion was based upon "a pre-exilic historical book of priestly origin," while in the legislative portion "everywhere we can see the old material shewing through the later envelope." This code and history Ezra brought with him to Jerusalem in 458. Finding on his arrival that public opinion would never consent to the throwing aside of JED in favour of P, he amalgamated the old and the new and produced substantially the present Pentateuch in 444. There were, however, certain later additions, such as Ex. 35–40, where the LXX presents the material "in a completely different order." * Finally he explains the survival of the old alongside the new by saying that from the eighth century at least "the ancient law and the ancient history were freely reproduced at the popular assemblies for worship." He cites in proof of this 1 Sa. 7^{16} and $12^{7ff.}$, which, he says, "present Samuel as an itinerant orator appearing in turn at the ancient sanctuaries of Bethel, Gilgal-Shechem and Mizpah." This illustrates the loose way in which far-reaching theories are based by Sellin and others upon quite inadequate data. There is no evidence whatever that the speech of Samuel at a political assembly of Israel (in 12) was in any way typical of his doings at the three centres, which he visited annually as judge, and neither passage treats of 'popular assemblies for worship,' although we may well believe that on such occasions sacrifices would be offered (11^{15}). His discussion of the question of the Tabernacle (pp. 88–90) suffers in the same way from the flimsy character of the data upon which he bases his conclusions.

iii. The third 'urgent question' is as to "the supposed uniformity of spirit and outlook" in P. This, we are

* See Table in McNeile, *The Book of Exodus* (Westminster Commentaries), p. 223–6.

curtly told, " is simply not true." P's account of the Flood and " Moses' prayer for the people after their sin with the golden calf " are given as two illustrations of " the large outlook " and " the non-legal attitude of some of those who wrote these later and additional accounts." The second of these is described as a " notable illustration " of the heights to which the Priestly writers could rise. But what critical writers assign Ex. 32^{30-34} to P ? The critics known to me assign it to JE, or a JE Editor, long prior to P ! As to the first, surely the fact is that " the supposed uniformity of spirit and outlook " is not supposed at all, in Welch's sense, by the men whose theory he is criticizing. P has its own outlook and way of reading history, but no sensible exponent of the modern view has to my knowledge ever suggested that the Priestly writers were incapable of writing any story of pre-Mosaic days with a large outlook. Wellhausen, e.g., speaks of " the exalted ease and the uniform grandeur that gave the narrative [of Creation] its character." In the narrative of the Flood P's standpoint is clear. Whereas, e.g., JE assumes that the distinction between clean and unclean animals was known in the days of Noah, P believes that it could not have been known before the law was promulgated from Mt. Sinai. Accordingly in P's version, " of every living thing of all flesh *two* of every sort, male and female," are brought into the ark (Gen. 6^{19-20}, 7^{14-16}, ctr. 7^{2-3a}). But this standpoint does not forbid him, rather it helps him, to " think principally of God's relation to the world " as lying beneath and behind " His relation to the chosen race." He believes that there was a covenant with ' all flesh ' as well as a covenant with Israel.* Welch says truly that " nothing could well be

* This is the answer to Eerdmans, who first lays down in an arbitrary manner principles which he attributes to P and then rules out large sections as not P because they seem to contradict these supposed principles. (See Sellin, *Introduction*, pp. 82–3 ; Article 1 (July), p. 18, and Skinner on Genesis, pp. xlii.–xliii.

further away from the narrow limits of late Jewish legalism." Modern scholars have no controversy with him on this point. They heartily agree. But when Welch points to the Book of Jubilees to shew "how the legalists of Jewry rewrote the origins of the world and of their nation" and seems to wish his readers to infer that this is "the spirit and outlook" which critical writers have 'supposed' to animate the writers of P, it is sufficient to point out that this book was written in the Maccabean period between 135 and 100 B.C., by a Pharisee of the straitest sect and at least three, if not four, centuries after P was compiled, and that no writer on the critical side has ever supposed that it in any way represented the spirit of the lovers of the law in the fifth century B.C.

3. We have still to consider the third point, viz. the nature and date of P, regarded as a code of law. The modern view has for fifty years regarded it as a post-exilic production. But, Welch says, "the more it has been studied by itself in the light of the modern historical method, the greater are the difficulties which have emerged, *if* it is to be regarded as uniform in its character and the product of so late a period"; and again, "the first thing that emerged was that the book, like Deuteronomy, was not a unity, but was the outcome of a long development." *

i. There is great virtue in the 'if,' which I have italicized. 'If' anyone has so regarded P, then undoubtedly difficulties arise for him. But, we may ask, who has ever so regarded it? Certainly not the men, whose theory we are dealing with. "It is an essential element of the critical position," wrote the late Prof. Burney, "that the Priestly Code embodies ritual usages, which grew up during a long period and many of which are doubtless of immemorial antiquity. . . . This is again and again emphasized in the writings

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, pp. 361 and 363.

of its earliest exponents." Burney justified this statement by a series of quotations.* I must content myself with quoting Wellhausen. As long ago as 1878 he spoke of "a kind of school" of priests as, in and after the Exile, "reducing to writing and to a system that which they had formerly practised in the way of their calling. . . . The Priestly Code is the last result of this labour of many years." It was not a new "creation," but the "systematizing of given materials, and this is what the originality of the Priestly Code in substance amounts to." In his second Edition in 1883 he added a paragraph to deal with the argument that "the laws of the Priestly Code are actually attested everywhere in the practice of the historical period; that there were always sacrifices and festivals, priests and purifications and everything of the kind in early Israel. "These statements," he says, "must, though it seems scarcely possible, proceed on the assumption that on Graf's hypothesis the whole cultus was invented all at once by the Priestly Code and only introduced after the Exile! But the defenders of Graf's hypothesis do not go so far as to believe that the Israelite cultus entered the world of a sudden. . . . They merely consider that the works of the law were done before the law, that there is a difference between traditional usage and formulated law, and that this difference . . . has a material basis, being connected with the centralisation of the worship and the hierocracy which that centralisation called into being." † When therefore Welch points out that laws "of a strikingly

* Burney in EXPOSITOR, February 1912, quoting Stade (1888); Driver, *Introduction*, Ed.[6], pp. 142–143; Kuenen, *Origin, etc., of the Hexateuch* (Engl. transl., 1886, pp. 272, 287); Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.* (1881), pp. 383 f. (1892, pp. 382 f.); Ryle, *Canon of the Old Testament* (1892), p. 71. To these may be added Skinner on Genesis, p. lvii.; and, perhaps best of all, Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch* (1900), vol. i., pp. 141–146.

† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (English translation from second German Ed.), pp. 404–405, 366, etc.

primitive character such as the ritual of the scapegoat and the offering of the red heifer " lie side by side with others which " are clearly of later date " and that " the code in fact, as a code, has a history behind it, a history of some length and of great complexity " * he is merely stating what had been in fact proclaimed long ago and by none more emphatically than by the critics of the last half century.

ii. It being then agreed that a long development has taken place, the question arises : " where did that development take place, and to what period in the community's life must it be referred ? " † Welch answers (*a*) that if all, or even much, of this took place after 444 B.C., it is " extremely difficult to explain how the Samaritans came to accept these later developments," and (*b*) that, if it took place earlier, it must have been in the period *before* the Exile. The reasoning here is difficult to follow. We saw in Article 3 (p. 170) that very possibly the Samaritan schism did not take place till 330 B.C., which allows of one hundred years of development after Ezra-Nehemiah. But, waiving that possibility, why must we choose between the period after 444 B.C. and the period before 586 ? There were, according to the usual chronology, about a hundred years between the first return and the days of Ezra, and at least from the days of Zerubbabel, Joshua, Haggai and Zechariah some kind of worship was carried on at Jerusalem. Why is this period to be ruled out ? And again there were at least fifty years of exile. Why is this period also ruled out ? Welch (following Torrey) answers that " it is inconceivable that the exiles . . . amused themselves by thinking out modifications of a ritual which they were not practising." What about Ezekiel ? The aim of the argument seems to

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, p. 363.
† *Ibid.*, p. 363–364.

be to lead us back to pre-exilic days, and the conclusion is reached that "the laws themselves must [for the most part] have existed under the Kingdom, but been reduced to order after the return. They underwent however at this period the minimum of revision. The real revision of individual laws took place before they were codified. There is even less novelty in the code of Ezra than in the code of Josiah." * We note that the codification did take place 'after the return.' But does Welch seriously mean to say that a 'minimum' of development took place as the result of the Exile and the hundred years which followed the return? Let us compare the above with the sketch which Wellhausen gives us of the post-exilic "Community once more lifting up its head around the ruined Sanctuary (Hagg. and Zech.)." "The usages and ordinances were, though everywhere changed in detail, yet not created afresh. Whatever creating there was lay in this, that these usages were bound together in a system and made the instrument of restoring an organization of 'the remnant.' Ezekiel first pointed out the way. Thus arose . . . the sacred constitution of Judaism. In the Priestly code we have the picture of it in detail. It is not the case that the hierocracy is based on the code; that code was only introduced after the hierocracy was already in existence, but it helped, no doubt, to consolidate and legalise it. . . . [In the days of Moses and of the Kings] Old Israel had not shrunk to a religious congregation, . . ., the high priest and the dwelling of Jehovah were not the centre round which all revolved. These great changes were wrought by the destruction of the political existence first of Samaria and then of Judah." † Here surely we have a much truer

* Expositor, May 1923, p. 365 (very slightly abbreviated).

† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 421–422; cp. Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. i., pp. 141–146.

estimate of the difference between the two periods before and after the Exile. The Code would not appear very novel in 444 B.C., because it mainly registered changes which had already taken place, but it would have appeared very novel to the men of 'Old Israel.' No doubt laws about the family, food, slavery, leprosy, the Nazarite and the like had been in force in some form or other from very early times, and were revised both before and after the Exile in the light of prophetic teaching. No doubt, again, there was a definite ritual practised at the sanctuaries in N. and S. Israel (Amos 5^{21-23}, 2 Kings 16^{12-16}), but it is by no means clear that in the days of Amos and Ahaz there was a written rule. Priesthoods in many religions have preserved a traditional ritual without possessing a written code.* But there naturally came a time when the priestly 'torah' had to be written down. Exodus 20^{22}–23 and 34, Deut. 12–26 and the Priestly Code represent different stages of codification, and the later stages are marked by the successive elaborations of the laws relating to the Place of worship, the Ministry and the Cult. A great deal of material in P was derived from the ancient time, but a great deal also shews a post-exilic development under foreign rule.

iii. The position of the Pentateuch at the beginning of the Bible necessarily conveyed the impression in pre-critical days that the Law, as it now stands, was given to Israel before their entrance into the land of promise and that the

* Welch on the strength of 2 Kings 17^{26-28} says that it "is known that at least one of these 'uses' of Bethel or Jerusalem was reduced to writing" (EXPOSITOR, May 1923, p. 365). How is it 'known'? No doubt "the returned priest renewed at Bethel the 'use' which Amos had witnessed," but all that 2 Kings says is that "he taught them how they should fear Yahweh." There is not the slightest proof that he brought with him a written code. "The manner of the God of the land" is contrasted with "the manner of the nations" (ver ^{33}). Was the latter also a written code?

messages of the prophets came after it. When critical study had revealed the fact that the Law was a composite Book and in its present form was post-exilic, it was realized that 'the Law did not precede the prophets; the prophets preceded the Law.' This, as we have seen did not mean that there was no law until after the prophets. Sacrifices there always were; social regulations necessarily took shape as soon as social and national life began; Moses, Samuel and their like delivered oral judgments; Priests developed traditional usage at the Sanctuaries; but all this was not formulated law. It was not apparently written down and published in code form until a late period in the national history. Welch * well pictures to us "the prophetic revelation playing upon the cult, criticising it, refining it, interpreting it," and he gives us two interesting pages (based upon Gunkel's work on the Psalms), shewing how psalms and formulæ and prophetic oracles, used or uttered at the time of sacrifice, would tend to introduce to the minds of the worshippers higher conceptions of Yahweh. "It may be even said that the cult, as it came to exist in later Israel, was largely the outcome of the prophet's work." Why, after saying this, Welch should go on to say that "this implies that the sharp antithesis . . . 'the law did not precede the prophets; the prophets preceded the law' is ceasing to have much meaning so largely must it be modified" is a mystery; it would seem to imply the opposite, and in the very next sentence he actually gives the true meaning of this dictum and practically declares it to be true: "the law, *as it came to be and as it exists* may have succeeded the prophets." Exactly; that is just what the scholars who propounded it meant and said, and nothing that has been said to the contrary has shaken this their position.

* Expositor, May 1923, pp. 366–368.

iv. In bringing this series of articles to a close, I should like, at the end as at the beginning, to thank Prof. Welch for having sent us back to examine foundations. We sought to enter upon these investigations with an open mind, ready to give full weight to all that could be said on either side, but I think that most of my readers will agree with me that, when all is said, the writers whom he has quoted and others whose writings we have considered have not 'seriously shaken' the main pillars of the modern view. They may have in certain cases helped us to see more clearly some of the steps in the living process of development which lies behind the Pentateuch as we now possess it, but that is another matter. Dr. S. A. Cook * believes "that Old Testament criticism is passing into a new phase." It is true that, e.g., with regard to early Canaanitish religion archæology is shedding new light, but the bearing of the new material upon the pre-prophetic religion of Israel is by no means clear. In any case the 'new phase,' if it establishes itself, does not seem likely to be in the direction of more conservative positions.† ·

J. Battersby Harford.

* See *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1924 and January 1925; *The Religion of Ancient Palestine*, 2000 to 1000 B.C. (Constable). See also Kittel, *The Religion of the People of Israel*, chap. i (Allen & Unwin, 1925).

† I would like to commend to my readers the article by my brother on *Leviticus* in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii., as shewing how critical studies light up the Law and provide (§ 7) material for spiritual edification. See also Prof. Moffatt's *The Approach to the New Testament*, pp. 235–236, and Prof. Peake's *A Guide to Biblical Study*, pp. 12–16 ("The chief aim of the study of the Old Testament is not to analyse the Hexateuch into its component parts, but to understand the course which was taken in the education of Israel to prepare for the coming of Christ").

AN UTTERANCE OF SOLOMON.

Modern criticism leaves us few authentic relics of the sayings or writings whereby David established his undying fame as a psalmist, or Solomon his proverbial reputation for wisdom. There is, however, an utterance attributed to the latter which, corrupt and fragmentary as it is in its surviving form, may represent authentic words of the great monarch. It is to be found in the traditional text of 1 Kings viii. 12 and 13, where, following our authorized translation, we read that when Solomon was performing the dedicatory rites of the Temple he prayed, "The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness. I have surely built thee an house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever." This versicle has as a parallel the long prayer of verses 14–61 which show undoubted Deuteronomic and Exilic (ver. 46) influence, and thus it probably belongs to earlier strata of tradition regarding the events of Solomon's reign. Some translations, etc. (LXX B, Lucian's *Recension Codex Legionensis*), reveal the fact that at some time a copyist or editor had added or restored a line at the beginning of these words, apparently on the evidence of a very ancient source. We have in these, at all events, a version which can be rendered :—

> The sun he placed in the heavenly dome,
> But Jahveh himself has declared that he will dwell in darkness,
> Now I have built a house, a dwelling for thee,
> A place of thy abiding for ever.
> Lo, is this not written in the book of the song ?

It is difficult, however, to believe either that this represents the *ipsissima verba* of Solomon, or that the original author of the narrative recording the Dedication inserted such words, as those of the principal actor in that great event. Whether we suppose that author to have known

what Solomon said or adapted some saying for his purpose we would, at the least, expect relevancy in the connexion of the verses with each other and also fitness to the situation, pictured with such dramatic force in the context, namely that the glory of God had so filled the house in a cloud-theophany that the priests could not stand to minister because of it. It is possible, however, that by the methods both of careful critical examination of the text and of judicious conjecture the authentic utterance may, at least approximately, be reached.

What then is the text in the form that critical authorities (e.g. Kamphausen, Cheyne, Skinner, etc.) would assign to it, with the minimum of alteration demanded by the Septuagint rendering ? The answer is the following reading :—

(12) אַז אָמַר שְׁלֹמֹה
שֶׁמֶשׁ הֵכִין בַּשָּׁמַיִם
יהוה אָמַר לִשְׁכֹּן בָּעֲרָפֶל׃
(13) בָּנֹה בָנִיתִי בֵּית זְבֶל לָךְ
מָכוֹן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ עוֹלָמִים׃

One question which at once arises is why should the editor represented by the traditional text omit the line, "The sun he placed in the heavens." There is nothing objectionable in it, and apparent irrelevance was not a reason to operate strongly in such a case. In this connexion a reconstruction of Professor Hugo Gressmann of Berlin is helpful. He suggests that the hateful word Baal occurred, and by reading יָכִין בַּעַל, as the opening words, provides us with a remarkable echo, or rather distinct confirmation, of the tradition of 1 Kings vii. 21 that the two brazen pillars of the Temple entrance were called Jachin (יָכִין) and Boaz (בֹּעַז). Boaz here may very easily be a corruption of Baal, as Lucian's *βααζ* and LXX B's *βαλαζ*, *ad loc*, distinctly suggest. We remember how

Ishbaal, the son of Saul, had to succumb to the fate of becoming instead of "God's man," "man-of-shame," by the strict law of the redactors who would allow no compromise with the thought of early polytheism. The pillars might have come to be named Jachin and Baal (the Baal-deity being of course Jahveh-Baal), because these were the first words of a historic utterance made from their base, especially if that utterance was daily repeated there in some early ceremonial. It is possible also, however, that the connexion came about through versicles beginning with such words catching the eye of a historian, who knowing that these were the names of the pillars, saw in such verses at once an utterance suitable for his narrative purpose and, that attractive morsel for the Hebrew chronicler, an explanation of a place-name.

Such a reconstruction, although it is a conjecture based merely on a version, is too brilliant to be lightly set aside, and one immediate effect of it is that the name, Jahveh, must disappear from the second line. There is strong additional reason for this in the very harsh construction, יהוה אָמַר לְשָׁכֵן. The infinitive is bare and awkward after אָמַר. Thus, תִּהְיֶה אָמַר לְשָׁכֵן is by no means a bold alteration, and one which may be said to be positively required, apart altogether from the conjectured Baal of the first line.

In the third line, בָּנֹה בָּנִיתִי בֵּית cannot be said to be beautiful, and the awkward *ἰδοὺ* of the Septuagint B in the line below, *οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται* seems to have leapt from its place. Further הִנֵּה בָּנִיתִי בֵּית would more easily account for the imperative found in the same version.

In the fourth line it is to be noted that this version has "for renewal" (*ἐπὶ καινότητος*) instead of the "for ever" of the Hebrew. The origin of this translation is not hard to find since the author of it probably simply read עַלוּמִים

where the Hebrew copyist read עוֹלָמִים, and he had this in his favour that the latter word in the plural and without a preposition, while perhaps not unparalleled, is certainly uncommon. The true original may, however, have been עָלוּם (or יָמִים עָלוּם), "hidden" ("through the days"), which reading alone has the advantage of being in perfect accord with play of light and darkness which runs through the whole little poem.

In accordance with these considerations the present authors would suggest that the versicles in the text of the author of the Dedication narrative read as follows:—

יָכִין בַּעַל שֶׁמֶשׁ בַּשָּׁמַיִם
תִּהְיֶה אָמַר לִשְׁכֹּן בָּעֲרָפֶל׃
הִנֵּה בָּנִיתִי בֵּית זְבֻל לָךְ
מָכוֹן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ עָלוּם׃

"Baal sets the sun in the heavens
Thou shalt be, he said, for dwelling in the cloud-mist;
Behold I have built a house as a veiling for thee,
A place for thy resting concealed."

We thus see that the Temple is thought of as equivalent to the heavenly pavilion, built by God for the sun. Its symbolism is eloquent of that conception. On Babylonian seal-cylinders (cf. Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder*, II, Abb. 12 f.) the sun-god is represented as rising between two pillars, even as Jachin and Boaz stood on the eastern front of the Temple. Within the Temple were ten lamps burning in one chamber perpetually, the counterpart of day, while in another chamber beyond was darkness, symbolic of that place to which the sun repaired at nightfall for concealment. The Phœnician builders of the Jerusalem temple no doubt profited from their race's intimate connexion with Egypt. Erman (*Ägyptische Religion*, p. 52) tells us that in the sacred fanes of that country the forecourt received the sunlight in undiminished glow, the next chamber

received it softened through door and window, while in the inner shrine deep darkness prevailed. The parallel of Court, Hekal and Debir in Solomon's Temple, is obvious, and we know that the reformers of Josiah's reign had need to remove the sun-horses and sun-chariots which stood before its gates (2 Kings xxiii. 11).

We must remember also that it was the Cloud Theophany which inspired to poetry. When we note this we cannot fail to see that each word expressing light and darkness has its own definite significance.

זְבֻל has the signification of "veiling" as in the Talmud (Breslau Dictionary) and עֲרָפֶל means not "thick darkness" but "thin darkness" (as *ibid.*) or the "lower sky" (Jastrow, *Dictionary of Talmud*). The latter word signifies in fact the bank of cloud-mist from which the rising sun emerges, and here refers to the cloud, before called "עָנָן," in which veiled God was actually taking up his dwelling in the place built for his habitation. The priests and king saw the Deity enter in, as the slanting rays of the sun flashed through the two pillars, and, reflected on the morning mists, filled the house with light. In the innermost shrine where darkness prevailed these beams were seen to disappear, a fitting token of that divine invisibility with which the imageless worship of Israel was always impressed. At such a time only might God be seen passing. The house had been constructed to make such a theophany possible at every sunrise, so that it is not impossible that the versicles were daily repeated at some early period of Temple-worship. At all events they furnish a fitting utterance for the great occasion when first king and people stood outside the palace of their building and saw the beams of the sun strike through the morning mists and enter the place designed for the divine in-dwelling.

That the above text or something similar to it was the

original of the narrative of 1 Kings viii. 1–13, the present authors are satisfied. They would suggest, however, that there may have been some still more primitive shape or Urform of the poem which the historian adapted for his purpose from a book of "Song" of Solomon or from the Book of Jashar. In such a region one may deal with the text with greater freedom and follow the lines of traditional polytheistic myths rather than of strict critical consideration of possible alterations in words and letters. Codrington (*Melanesians*, p. 156 ff. as quoted Wundt, *Zur Psychologie und Ethik*, p. 94) gives an example of a myth which presents parallel features to the conceptions of our versicle. Qatl, the Creator, began his work by creating men, trees, etc. His brothers, of whom he had eleven, said, "Let it not be always day, for that is irksome." Accordingly, hearing that Night dwelt on a neighbouring island, he sailed there and bought it, brought with him also a hen and other birds to announce the change from day to night. When he returned the sun began to sink in the West. The brothers sank their eyes and feared that they would die, but Qatl taught them that this was sleep. Our lines may be the reflection of a similar sun-myth and the belief in the healing power of darkness and be read thus :—

> When Baal set Shemesh (the Sun-god) in the Heavens,
> The god (Shemesh) said, I will dwell in the cloud-mist,
> Build me a house, a veiling for me
> A place for my resting concealed (or for renewal).

A better and more fruitful line of alteration is suggested by consideration of the characteristics of Sun-worship in Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian religions. We have already noted the awkward אָמַר לִשְׁכֹּן of the traditional Hebrew. If we were to expect a parallel to the personified Sun of the first line, it would certainly be in the form of that deity, almost invariably associated with the sun in

these cults, namely Adad, who is also often called Martu, Mer, Rimmon, and Amurru. A. Jeremias, in his well-known work, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, and also M. Jastrow ("Babylonian Religion," *H. B. D.*) note this connexion and companionship. The latter states: "Shamash and Adad appear so frequently in hymns and in oracles as the lords of justice that one is justified in interpreting this association in terms of a doctrine, forming part of the Babylonian theology." One example of this frequent partnership may be given. In an inscription celebrating Marduk as highest divinity which Gressmann quotes as given by Pinches in the *Journal* of the Victoria Institute of 1896, Marduk is identified with each of the individual gods of the Pantheon and there appears the inseparable couple:—

Shamash is Marduk in respect of Light,
Adad is Marduk in respect of Rain.

Altering our awkward אָמַר to אֶת אֲמִרוּ, we might imagine an Urform which would translate:—

Baal has set Shemesh in the Heavens
With Amurru to dwell in the cloud-mist.
Behold I have built a house of veiling for thee
A place for thy resting upon the seas.

In this case the vexatious final word would almost certainly be עַל־יַמִּים = upon the seas. The thought of Shemesh resting in his bower on the sea is beautifully illustrated by a representation of Shemesh of Sippar (Abbildung 165 in Jeremias' work, 92 in Gressmann's *Bilder*), sitting in his bower in front of which is the flame-crossed sun-wheel, the whole picture resting on a conventional sea. In our fragment we must suppose that the Baal-Shamayim, or Lord of the Heavens, gives to the Sun-god and the Storm-god housing in his own broad domain.

Oliver Shaw Rankin.
W. W. D. Gardiner.

THE APOCALYPSE.

ANYONE who propounds a theory should be grateful for all serious and well-informed criticism of it. As I have always learned more from those who differ from me than from those who are of the same opinion, I am indebted to Dr. Beet for showing me where the difficulties are felt in my presentation of the case, and still more for giving me the occasion for re-stating the essential part of the theory, apart from what I have built upon it. As mere policy, it is a mistake to put forth a theory, and, at the same time, to offer a re-arrangement and an interpretation based upon it, because this offers the opportunity of arguing backwards to the failure of the theory from matters which might in many points be wrong, without even weakening the probability of the theory itself.

Thus one critic dismisses the whole as the work of a twentieth-century philosophical theologian, though that only applies, or, at least, is only applied by him, to the interpretation. Even in this matter, the mind of such a person might be at least as near to the mind of John as the mind of a modern literary critic. But on the essential question of the analysis of the text, it is obviously a quite irrelevant consideration. The possibility of a reasonable interpretation would no doubt help to confirm the theory—as, for example, if it should be true, as so eminent a New Testament scholar as Professor König thinks, that the interpretation impresses him by its sobriety, and must, in the main, be on right lines. But that would be enough, however many errors there might be on detail.

Again, there may be mistakes in the rearrangement without disproving in any way that the analysis of the text into equal sections is wrong. After the analysis, we

should still be only in the same position as the original editor: and, though it might be possible to succeed better by ridding ourselves of some of his wrong pre-suppositions, there would still be possibilities of mistake.

Finally, I have held that the editor has divided some sections, and it is possible that these sections have been wrongly made up. Yet if the seventeen whole sections wrought out rightly, and what remained divided exactly by nine, these mistakes would in no way disprove the theory.

For that reason, I intend to deal here mainly with the fundamental part of the theory, which is, that when glosses are omitted, the book divides into 26 exactly equal sections, with one more which is shorter because it is the last, apart from the further questions of rearrangement and interpretation.

The main question reduces itself to this: When glosses are removed, are the whole sections equal, and is the rest the proper length for what remains?

Two other questions then arise:

(1) Are the divisions of the text natural divisions?

(2) Are the glosses omitted really glosses?

The second is the more important, because the divisions, in the main, are very clearly marked, and no critic has seriously challenged them.

The weakness of the theory, as originally presented, undoubtedly was that, while the divisions were fixed by an objective standard, the glosses were determined on the ground, mainly at least, of what seemed to be irrelevant. This raises two other questions: first, whether everything equally irrelevant was omitted; and, second, whether relevancy was not determined by my own subjective standard, and to suit my idea of the length of the sections.

Even to the argument as it stands, Dr. Beet does scant

justice. First, some sections are exact as they stand and some more practically so; and, second, in some other sections, as, for example, § XII (chap. vi. 2–17), all that is removed as glosses is repetition of one phrase, with only the numerals different, which could not have been selected to suit the length.

But I am ready to take the section on the Trumpets, which Dr. Beet specially selects (chaps. viii. 1–ix. 21).

To begin with, I am very far from being alone in regarding the first four as spurious. Dr. Charles, for one, argues against their genuineness. Indeed, there are few serious commentators who defend them. Now the three left are precisely the length which has been determined on other grounds, without any omission whatsoever: and, as the standard of length was determined quite apart from this section, this would be very remarkable as pure accident.[1]

Dr. Beet's first argument for the genuineness of the first four is against an argument which depends on my rearrangement, so that may pass. The second and third, about the senseless destruction of thirds and the poverty of thought and expression, are not my arguments in particular. Dr. Beet is not impressed by them, but I still think that they are sound arguments, and they have convinced other students of the subject besides myself. But the important argument is the fourth. The first point in it is that, in a symbolic work of the type of the Apocalypse, literary consistency is hardly to be looked for. This must be applicable only within very narrow limits, because, if any inconsistencies can be put together, there would be no use arguing about the book: and, if a method of rearrangement does away with inconsistencies, this would surely be an argument in

[1] This does not necessarily prove that there is no change in the text, because the transcriber would be aware of the length of his sheet and might be unconsciously influenced by it in putting in as much as he took out, but that would not be accident.

its favour. The second point of the argument is that there is, as a matter of fact, no inconsistency, " for the destruction in the earlier passage touched but a third of the whole." Dr. Beet has evidently not verified his reference here, because it says in the first trumpet that " all green grass was burned." How, then, can it say in the fifth : " It was told them not to hurt the pasture of the earth, nor aught green " ? He might argue that it had grown again, but why should it be wholly destroyed in the first, and specially spared in its entirety in the fifth ?

There is, however, another argument against the genuineness of the first four trumpets, which I failed to notice at the time. It is the extent to which they are mere doublets of the first four vials (xvi. 2–9). The first is on the land ; the second on the sea, the sea becoming blood, and all living creatures dying in it—which is the more certainly a doublet from the attempt to make Greek of the author's Hebrew idiom in the vials ; the third on the rivers and fountains of waters ; the fourth on the sun, with the addition of moon and stars from xiii. 1, and the darkening from the fifth vial.

Other doublets are viii. 7, " and he cast it into the earth," from viii. 5, and the suggestion of the thirds from ix. 18.

What is left are the phrases, viii. 7, " all green grass was burned." " And there was hail and fire mingled with blood." Verse 8, " as a great mountain burning with fire." Verse 10, " and there fell from heaven a great star blazing like a torch." Verse 11, " The name of the star was Wormwood," and " The waters became wormwood."

That some at least of these clauses are from the vials is rendered probable by the fact that they exhibit the author's usual use of Old Testament references, and by the unlikelihood that the editor would have introduced what was inconsistent with what follows, without an original.

It would be a delicate task to restore these passages, yet they seem to confirm the view taken in the book, that the first five vials refer to past oppressors of the true Israel. Thus all the clauses from the first trumpet, however we put them together with the first vial, seem to be drawn from the plagues of Egypt. The blazing mountain suggests the destruction of Sodom and the mountain of the Law, " burning with fire unto the heart of heaven " (Deut. iv. 11), which was, if not in, very near the land Ezekiel calls Sodom. The great star fallen from heaven seems to depend on Isaiah xiv. 2, " How art thou fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of the morning "—which is Babylon. Then there are several Old Testament references to the waters of Babylon.

The interpretation of the first five vials, as an account of the past, depends, however, on the much larger question : Why the conflict is always spoken of as of long duration, yet the expectation of the end is at hand. On any interpretation of the book, the purpose is to preach endurance ; and John does seem to say that the trial will be harder and longer than his fellow Christians are preparing for. But, while the hardest part is to come, it is the death-agony of the powers of darkness, and the end is to come shortly. How are these seeming opposites to be combined, if all the calamities are yet to come ? The explanation I have offered is that an important part of John's appeal is that every faithful Christian is entering upon an age-long conflict, and that he must not fail at the end. Dr. Beet's criticisms do not seem to assail that broad conclusion, or challenge seriously any of its applications.

But the point which is relevant to the present discussion is that, when these passages are restored, and chap. xi. 14–19 and xiv. 6–xvi. 16 have all doublets omitted from them, they divide somewhat differently from what I have done, but more naturally, and make up exactly the expected

lengths. This happens to have been the one part which left me wholly dissatisfied : and I stated in the book that it stood alone. Had Dr. Beet chosen to take § X. (chap. xv. 5–xvi. 16) as an example of subjective selection of glosses, he would have had a good case. But now the problem solves itself purely on the question of doublets : and when this was followed out, it was found to apply to the whole book.

It may well be asked, why, especially as so large a part of what I had excluded were doublets, I did not discover this test at the time. But I suppose that I am not the first person, who, when working with a mass of detail, could not see the wood for the trees. In some subconscious way I must have noticed it, because, as soon as I dismissed the subject from my conscious mind, and turned to other studies, it occurred to me. The result was to find that all the sections as they stand, with the exception of § X, part of which I have found not to belong to it, and two short clauses from the doublet xix. 9, 10, which had to be restored in the same way as the passages in the vials, and the extra line which I thought was found in § XIX, which disappears, when all doublets are omitted, all are exact—more remarkably exact indeed than before—when every doublet in the book, not guaranteed clearly by the context, is removed. In the complete sections most of what I had excluded are doublets, but in the other sections, where the task was more difficult, I have more frequently gone astray.

But the important point is that all the seventeen complete sections, as I had divided them, work out precisely, and that, in addition to the test of glosses by the length of each section, there is the further test that the glosses are all free doublets—that is, doublets not guaranteed by the context—and that these two tests rigidly coincide.

In what follows I shall deal mainly with these undivided

sections, because the composite passages present an intricate problem, which would take too long to explain ; and only, if the reader were convinced by the simpler examples, could he be expected to take the trouble to understand. In respect of the rest it must suffice to say that, when put together, the whole makes up the remaining sections exactly, and that, while it shows that I was wrong in the positions I had assigned to certain passages, it does not alter my sections, except in the cases stated above. In any case, the whole sections are a fair test, because they were fixed beforehand, and the new test has not required me to alter one of them, but works out with quite astonishing exactness.

The first four sections, I said in the book, are more exact, if all the repetitions of " He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit says to the Churches," are omitted, than on the omission i. 20*a*, which I there prefer, while retaining the first as well as the last " He that hath an ear." Now I see that the reasons for the omission of i. 20*a* and the retention of ii. 7*a* are wrong. First, in rejecting i. 20*a*, I was dominated by the ordinary idea of a gloss, as an interjected explanatory clause. But further study of the book showed that the author gives many such explanations, which are undoubtedly genuine, and I ought to have gone back and revised my judgment. The second argument also is wrong, for " mystery " is used in much the same sense in xvii. 7, where it is also in a similar explanation. The argument about repetition of sevens is not of any value by itself, and while there is no parallel, there might be a reason for this repetition at the beginning. Finally, the seven spirits of God are so uncertain, that they may be the angels of the Churches. But the chief failure was in not seeing that the clause " He that hath an ear " to be retained was the last, not the first. Only at the end is it relevant ; and what the Spirit says to the Churches is least of all

relevant after only one has been mentioned The change of position in the message, which I thought at the time to be important, I now see to be dependent solely on the purely verbal connection of " This thou hast " in the previous verse. This dependence on mere verbal connexions I have mentioned, but I now see that it is much more constant than I had then recognized.

I give the sections in my book, lest any reader should have it and care to refer to it, but I go through the text in its present order, to show the effect of omitting all free doublets as glosses.

§§ I–IV (chaps. i.–iii.) with the omission of all doublets of iii. 22 as explained above.

In §§ XX, XXI (iv. 1–vi.1), I have no glosses, and, though there are doublets from this passage, the originals are evidently here, for none of them could be omitted.

In § XII (vi. 2–17) all that I have omitted as glosses are doublets of vi. 1, with the mere alteration of the numerals.

In § XXII (vii.) the passages omitted as glosses are, first, the last clause in verse 2, which is from 3*a*, only grammatically altered, with " to whom it was given " to which there are several parallels ; and, second, verses 5–8, which is simply an arithmetical doublet of " 144 thousand slain from every tribe of the sons of Israel " in verse 4.

§§ XXIII, XXIV (viii., ix), about the trumpets, have already been discussed. Nothing has been omitted in the three I have retained, and I have already explained that I now retain everything that is not doublet in the rest. The last clauses of viii. 5 and ix. 2, however, are doublets, and in place of them xvi. 7 after vii. 5 seems to be in place.

Chapter x. I have treated as part of a divided section (§ V) and without glosses.

In § VI (chap. xi. 1–13) I have omitted " and gave glory to the God of heaven " as a gloss, on the ground that what

follows shows that the men did not repent. But it is not a doublet of anything in the book. We have "They cursed the God of heaven," but all the other doublets are accurate verbal reproductions, except for the grammatical changes and changes of numbers which were made necessary by the connexion. Moreover, the phrase "God of heaven," as a name of power, may have been deliberately chosen to show that their state of mind was awe and not repentance. But there is a doublet in verse 7, "that coming up from the abyss," which is from xvii. 8, with only the necessary grammatical changes. For treating this as a gloss there is the reason that xvii. 8 shows that this was not the name of the beast, but merely an account of what he was about to do, as he was then in the abyss. Moreover, his origin is the sea, not the abyss. Also, if my order were correct, the beast is still on the earth, and not yet in the abyss. This makes the section quite exact, while it was very slightly short with my omission.

xi. 14–19 combines with xiv. 6–xv. 4 (§§ XXV and XXVI). The whole passage (ch. xiv. 6–xvi. 16) I pass over as presenting too complicated a problem to be discussed here. I can only repeat that when the very extensive doublets are deducted and the clauses which are not doublets from the first four trumpets are added, the whole works out exactly.

In §§ VII–IX (xii. 1–xiv. 5) I omitted only one short clause, "for they are virgins" (xiv. 4). This I stated that I did with some dubiety. There is nothing, however, in the least parallel to this in the book. There is one doublet and only one, xiii. 9*a*, "if anyone has an ear let him hear," and the omission of this makes the section quite exact. The argument that xiv. 4*b* has to do with freedom from idolatry, not celibacy, still holds, but this is explained by xvii. 2.

In §§ XIII–XVI (xvi. 17–xix. 9*a*) the passages I have

omitted which prove to be doublets are xvi. 18*a* of xi. 19*c*, xvii. 14*b* of xix. 16*b* with the order reversed, and xviii. 21, last clause, of verse 22*b*. But to xvi. 21*b* there is no exact parallel. It has a general resemblance to other passages, but it is not, as all the others are, an exact use of the same words of another passage, except for the necessary grammatical and numerical changes. The other real doublets in this passage are xvii. 11*a*, from xvii. 8, and the last clause of xix. 5, which is from xi. 18, with the necessary grammatical changes. The result again shows a more remarkable precision than before.

Of the rest of the text, I take chapters xx. 11–xxi. 8 to be the close of the book, and xxii. 8–9 to be editor's epilogue. The test of glosses shows that, in what remains, I have treated two passages wrongly. First, I have transferred the wrong passage to chapter x. But, as the right passage is of the same length when the doublet is removed, this does not affect the standard of length. The other is that xxii. 8, 9, is the original and should remain where it is, while xix. 9,10, is the doublet. What is not doublet in xix. 9,10, should, however, be restored to xxii. 8, 9. When this is done, and all free doublets omitted, the result is exact, and not a line too much as before.

This leaves no line to be added to §§ XX–XXI (chaps. iv. 1–vi. 1) as I had supposed. I stated that the shortness might be due to the number of long words, and, therefore, the fewer intervals, in the passage, and in some texts, like the R.V. it is the usual length. But Gebhardt has proved so uniformly accurate that it is difficult to admit an exception. There is just one line in the introduction which is not doublet (i. 5*b*–*c*), and probably it should be inserted somewhere in this passage.

This test of doublets solves a problem I had raised : Why, when the editor is so careful to observe his own rule, not to

take away from the words of the book, does he so freely add ? The answer is that he did not think that repeating his author was adding.

That the removal of these doublets detracts somewhat from " the sonorous eloquence," as Dr. Beet says, may be true, for it is possible that the editor's reason for inserting them was in some cases just to add to it. But let us take the example Dr. Beet selects " He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches." As one closing word, it is a moving appeal to consider that what has been said is said to all ; while, as a phrase repeated at intervals, it is mere " sonorous eloquence " and far less really impressive.

The care the editor takes to repeat with verbal accuracy is a valuable test of the accuracy with which he transcribed the original.

This enables me to answer one of Dr. Beet's objections to my method : what he regards as my ruthless treatment of the text along with punctiliousness about it. Throughout I have maintained that my treatment shows that the editor's text has been transmitted with great accuracy. I am not an authority on texts, and have no right to an opinion. But I have a vague idea that the tendency on the whole is in favour of what is known as the Western text. In any case, the question of text is within very narrow limits. But no question of text can concern anything beyond the work of the editor, because it can only show what he left, not what he found. The critics of the Pentateuch have the same problem. They believe that the text has been so accurately transmitted that they can argue from words like Yahweh and Elohim. If, however, their inquiries into the originals of the work are to be limited by the present text, they must necessarily retire from business. But if only doublets have been inserted this carries us much further than the critics

of the Pentateuch can go, for it proves that the editor of Revelation handled his text with the utmost care.

Only two questions, so far as I foresee, can arise. The first concerns the divisions. They are, I think, sufficiently definite in themselves : but, in any case, I made them without any thought of glosses, and, if they are quite phenomenally exact when nothing is omitted except doublets, were that mere accident, it would be a very remarkable example of the long arm of coincidence.

The second concerns the question of which is original and which is doublet. No reader, I think, will have serious doubt, at least in most cases, and in the unbroken sections I had already rejected the larger proportion of them, purely on the ground of irrelevancy.

I am loth to go farther, because I should like this one question of the division of the text to be considered, without complication from other questions on which it does not depend. But Dr. Beet has other objections, which, if I remained silent on them, I might be seeming to admit. It is to be hoped, however, that the reader will remember that the question discussed above stands alone, and that nothing I have said about it need be wrong, even were I mistaken about all the other points I now proceed to discuss.

That I should succeed, at the first shot, in solving correctly every difficulty of interpretation and the many detailed questions which arise, was highly improbable, and it may be that, in view of this probability, I have not always shown becoming modesty, but have put forward my views too much with what Dr. Beet calls " a tone of assurance." But I could not be always explaining and apologizing : and personally such apologies in a book always annoy me, because it seems to assume that, where they are not given, something more is being offered than the author's best judgment. As a matter of fact, I have found a great many

more mistakes than Dr. Beet has discovered. So far as I can see, he has, indeed, only hit upon one—the wrong place I have assigned to xix. 9, 10. To the rest I propose to reply, but I may say once for all that it is only with my best judgment upon the facts under discussion.

I begin with Balaam and Jezebel. Dr. Beet thinks that they represent movements, not the originators of them. Personally I still think that very improbable, but, as, in any case, they represent what came to be movements, it would not materially affect the general interpretation of the passage.

Next I take the 1260 days. With many others, I take that to mean the 1260 years of the World-rule. Dr. Beet says that this is not easy to harmonize with the facts of history. Had he said why, it would be easier to answer, but I never imagined that it could with any exactness. The question does not concern our chronology, but John's.

Dr. Beet finds difficulty in *βασιλεῖς* being used for kings and also for monarchies, but it is quite certain that the word is so used in the LXX of Daniel.

The only other point Dr. Beet raises about the monarchies is the interpretation of " a sea of the dead " as the " Dead Sea." This name he says " does not seem to have come into use until the second century of our era, when it appears in Pausanias, Justin, and one or two other writers." Revelation was written towards the end of the first century, apparently by a Palestinian Jew. Considering how many ancient names of places have never been mentioned in literature, we cannot assume that the use of any name is contemporaneous with its mention by writers. But, in this case, seeing that we have it mentioned by writers so far apart as Pausanias and Justin, who both probably learned it from the Jews, it is not assuming much to suppose that it was familiar to a Palestinian Jew a generation earlier.

The next question is the number of the beast. After

reading my explanation again, it seems reasonably clear for a condensed exposition. But, as it has perplexed Dr. Beet, I shall try to re-state the case, taking more care to distinguish between what is known as fact and what is merely conjecture.

1. The author expects that any sensible person will know what the number is. It is likely, therefore, to be a number already mentioned; and the only one is the 1260 days of the World-rule.

2. Read as an inscription, the first letter of the Greek numerals has the value of 1000, the second of 60, and by a slight alteration in the form of the letter, the third of 200.

3. It is now known that the "mark" was a mercantile stamp. More than one example has been found, and on all is the name "Cæsar." Possibly at this date there was nothing else.

4. The solution is obviously not in the Greek letters, as they do not combine into any meaning, so we naturally seek it in the Hebrew numerals, probably the only other system known to the author. Isaiah viii. 1 confirms the view that "the number of a man" has this meaning. Dr. Beet asks what connexion "pen" could have with "number." I did not say it had. What I said was that several authorities held that the phrase, translated "the pen of a man," means the phonetic writing as opposed to a more learned and difficult form, probably cuneiform. I did not enter into the question of the translation, but it should then be "the writing of the common man," as opposed to the learned.

5. There is no question about the letters of this writing being used for numerals. As John only uses three in Greek, he would be working with three in Hebrew, *koph*, *samech*, *resh*. Their value in order is 100, 60, 200. Even, if we could make no guess as to how 100 was raised to 1000,

this is sufficiently near to suggest that it was done somehow.

Possibly a person more familiar with the later Hebrew numeral system may know, though I doubt if any person's knowledge goes very far. My ignorance at least makes the following suggestion only conjecture. Conjecture, however, appears here for the first time, because the change in the third Greek letter is guaranteed by the value of the Hebrew.

The most likely is that John read the word in another common Hebrew form with a *yod* after the first letter, but, if so, as he reproduces them with only three numerals, he read the first two together. This he was entitled to do because *yod* is not a consonantal letter here, but a sign for the vowel, which merely modified the sound of the first letter. Therefore, there is a reason why he should multiply the first by it, while merely adding the others. Both the Greeks and the Hebrews probably learned their numeral systems from the Phœnicians, and there is a possibility that the mark like an acute accent, which the Greeks used, as we used naughts, for higher numerals than the alphabet could express, is merely the relic of a *yod*. In any case *yod*, being 10, was the natural sign to use for multiplying by 10. This, for aught we know, may have been a common usage, but, even if John invented it, it is not more forced than is usually found in such parallels, or would probably be found, if we knew more, in his use of the word "Harmagedon."

Dr. Beet further thinks that, even if this solution be correct, it does not accomplish much, for the mystery of the number remains. I think that the 1260 days stands for the years of the World-rule ; Dr. Beet has his doubts. About this we need not quarrel, for, whether they be years or not, it is certainly the number associated with the World-rule. Here, John says, is the name on the stamp which prohibits Christians from doing business, the number

of which shows it to represent the wicked World-power, and the Christians should not wonder at suffering from it. This surely would clear up the perplexity considerably.

The rest concerns two points of interpretation—the Man-Child and the Living Creatures. On them I can only say that, if I ever come to alter my opinion, it will not be on Dr. Beet's arguments. Why should a parallelism need to be complete in every particular ? And, if a person is carried through the air, where is the difficulty in seeing how the representative of it could help ?

JOHN OMAN.

REVIEWS.

Sacrifice in the Old Testament ; its Theory and Practice. By G. B. Gray, D.Litt. Clarendon Press. Pp. xv + 434.

At the time of his death Dr. Gray stood almost alone in the front rank of European Old Testament scholars, and was certainly the greatest that the English-speaking world had produced since Lowth. He died at a comparatively early age, when we were still looking forward to many years of fruitful study from him, and not a few of us felt that, in spite of the magnificent work he had already done, he was still at the beginning of his best achievements. A list of his published works included in this volume contains over seventy magazine articles, every one of which is important, and eight separate volumes, including three in the International Critical Commentaries. Yet many of us will feel that this posthumous work on Sacrifice, printed from the manuscript of his Speaker Lectures, admittedly incomplete, and lacking the final revision of the author, is yet his greatest work.

The book falls into four sections. The first deals with the theory of Sacrifice, and Dr. Gray was concerned to shew that the "communion" theory to which Robertson Smith gave such prominence was not the only view that was held, and that men increasingly regarded sacrifice as a gift made to God, especially for propitiation and expiation. He then discusses the nature and the history of the Altar, adding a couple of chapters on the

Sacrificial Service in Heaven, with special reference to the Apocalypse. Dr. Gray was almost as much at home in the New Testament as he was in the Old Testament. The other two sections are concerned with the Hebrew Priesthood and with the Festivals, the Passover receiving about half the space given to this last head.

In the course of study a number of disputed questions are raised. On every one Dr. Gray brought to bear his profound scholarship and his patient research, summing up and weighing each piece of evidence with that calm sanity which was so marked a feature of all his work. He is never afraid to leave a problem unsettled if he felt that the balance of evidence on either side was too slight to justify certainty. The result is that where he expresses an opinion we know that all the field has been surveyed and feel that the last word has been said. Whilst it may be true that he seldom discovered fresh facts, he was well aware of all that had been brought to light by others, and none knew better how to appraise their value.

Thus in nearly every chapter some controversial point arises. The essential theory of sacrifice has already been mentioned, but there are disputed questions relating to the Altar, especially in early times, and to the Altar in Heaven. Even the priesthood has its problems, and there is room for wide differences of opinion on some of the festivals. All are handled with the same steady thoroughness, the same deliberate care. Not a point slips the writer's notice, and each has its full value assigned to it. As a discussion of the subject this book will remain for a generation the standard work on the subject.

Dr. Gray writes, as always, in a restrained judicial style. It was, indeed, characteristic of him to dread any display of emotion, and there is a certain austerity in his manner which does, as a matter of fact, conceal feelings often profound. Nevertheless there are times when his inner spirit pierces the veil of his reticence, and rises to heights of genuine eloquence. Such are the closing paragraphs of chapter ix. (the later history of the Altar) and the conclusion of the chapter on the Paschal meal. On the other hand the book ends abruptly, and it may well be that if Dr. Gray had lived to prepare it for the Press himself, the conclusion would have been very different.

So while we welcome and value this volume, it brings home to

us again our loss in Dr. Gray's death. Three years have been spent in its preparation for the Press, and much has happened in that time. We should like to have had his opinion on such subjects as de Groot's theory of the Altars in Jerusalem, and on the reconstructions of the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles suggested by Mowinckel and Gressmann. But it is idle to regret what we have lost ; it is much that this has been preserved for us, for it helps us to realize afresh how much Old Testament scholarship still owes to Buchanan Gray.

* * * * *

Micah, Obadiah, Joel and Jonah (Westminster Commentaries). Rev. Canon G. W. Wade, D.D. London : Methuen. Pp. clxiii + 156. Price 16*s*.

Dr. Wade's work is already well known and valued, and he has here given us a really important contribution to the study of these four Prophets. The usual plan of the series is followed, and an introduction to all four books is followed by the text of the R.V. with notes at the foot of the page. Dr. Wade has added an interesting study of Messianic Prophecy (perhaps the most original part of the work) and a useful account of the accepted principles of Hebrew poetic form. The introduction is full and thorough, and presents the normal critical view in a way which is clear and adequate without being aggressive, though it seems that some of the more recent criticism of the Prophets has been overlooked.

Dr. Wade has before him books which in some passages are distinctly difficult. His notes are, therefore, full, but not unduly extended, and he has taken pains to make clear practically everything which leaves a question in the mind of a lay reader. But whilst the series is primarily intended for those who have not studied Hebrew, this (like several other of the volumes) cannot safely be neglected by the scholar. For Dr. Wade is not content merely to give modern equivalents and alternative renderings ; he aims (and with success) at an appreciation of the message and personality of the Prophets with whom he has to deal.

* * * * *

Jonah : Prophet and Patriot. By D. E. Hart-Davies, M.A. London : Thynne & Jarvis. Pp. xii + 144. Price 3*s*.

" This book represents an attempt to vindicate the historical character of the Mission of Jonah, as recorded in the prophecy

which bears his name, and, at the same time, to suggest a method of interpretation which renders the entire narrative consistent and harmonious both in itself and in its connexion with the New Testament references." So Mr. Hart's preface opens, and he seeks to achieve the end he thus sets before him in a fashion which does not lack either clarity or enthusiasm, though many readers will remain unconvinced by his arguments. He has six chapters, the first introductory, the second stating the evidence for the historicity of the book, the third giving a reason why Jonah fled to Tarshish, the fourth claiming to present the narrative historically, the fifth dealing with the miraculous element in the book, and the last linking Jonah with Our Lord.

Superficially the book has all the marks of a popular attack on Higher Criticism. We have the occasional objection to the modern habit of venturing to differ from the opinions received by so many wise, learned and good men of the past; the pathetic belief in the final validity of logic; the implicit (perhaps unconscious) assumption that a Critic aims at overthrowing faith, and that the acceptance of his opinions is a dangerous matter; the curious attempt to prove the validity of miracle by showing that miracles are not really miracles but only unusual, though natural, events; the appeal to archæology. One or two points made are valid, e.g. the size of "Nineveh," but Mr. Hart should have checked the statements he makes about Belshazzar on p. 32 and about Genesis xiv. on p. 33; he seems to have been relying on Sayce. Further, he has gone out of his way to make a reference to the controversy over Daniel, and has alluded on p. 37 to the "argument" that Greek musical instruments are mentioned in the book, failing to observe that the real point here lies in the fact that one of them, at any rate, does not seem to be mentioned by any *Greek* author before 200 B.C. But these are hardly relevant details, though they serve to illustrate the tone of the book, and, after repeating familiar arguments drawn from consensus and similar points, he states what he believes to be Jonah's real reason for his attitude to Nineveh, claiming that this will solve the most serious difficulty. Jonah, Mr. Hart believes, fled from Nineveh because he saw that if she were not destroyed she would one day overthrow Israel. Rather than sacrifice his own country, he will risk death and the displeasure of his God.

This is a far nobler motive than those usually attributed to the

prophet, but if it be accepted it still leaves us with the fact that in the end Jonah gave way and failed to carry his patriotism to its logical conclusion. And in any case it will seem to many readers that it hardly offers us a valid reason why the book should have been given to us, and we shall still prefer to find in this the noblest height that the religion of the Old Testament reached, and the clearest prevision of the Gospel that Judaism ever received. This, however, like nearly everything else that Mr. Hart has to say, is a matter of opinion rather than of argument, and we can only say with Canon Nairne that if he prefer to hold that view " let him do so in all charity, and give thanks to God."

At the same time we gladly recognize that this is *not* an ordinary conservative polemic, and many of us who disagree entirely with Mr. Hart's opinions will sympathize profoundly with him personally. For, especially towards the end of the book, we realize that his opinions are dictated by an intense passion for the honour of Jesus, and a fear that the elimination of Jonah from the page of history may in the end lead to the excision of Christ. We would ask him to believe that those who differ from him on the vexed question of " kenosis " are with him in personal devotion to their Lord, and, above all, that there does not seem to be the slightest chance that any " critic " will ever maintain in future that " there is . . . no proof that Jesus Christ ever existed." On the contrary, the more thoroughly the critical spirit sifts and winnows the evidence, the clearer and the more certain do the facts of the life and death of Jesus become. Criticism, like every other movement of the spirit, is a venture of faith, and in the end it can only lead the honest and prayerful student nearer to God in Christ.

* * * * *

Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature. By Harry Ranston, M.A., Litt.D. London: Sharp (The Epworth Press). Pp. 154. Price 6*s*.

It is generally recognized that Koheleth stands apart from all other Biblical writings, not only in style (which is sufficiently marked) but still more clearly in outlook. There is no other Jewish literature of this kind known to us, and the natural suspicion arises that here we have dependence on the thinking of some other people. It is true that there are scholars who insist that everything in the book can be explained as a spontaneous

development from the more ordinary types of Hebrew thought, but the weight of opinion seems to be on the other side. The source of this foreign influence is generally assumed to be Greek, and again there are differences as to the way in which it was brought to bear. Some scholars find traces of direct contact with Stoic or Epicurean philosophers, others are satisfied with the general atmosphere of Greece.

Dr. Ranston approaches the inquiry from a new angle. He thinks that too much attention has been paid to Greek thought after Plato, and too little to earlier writers, and his book is a discussion of the possibilities of contact, direct or indirect, with some of the older Greek authors. His interest is in the philosophers and poets of the sixth century and earlier; Theognis, Hesiod, Phokylides, Xenophanes, Archilochus, Simonides and Solon are included amongst the authors he discusses. All these, and others, are treated with care and sympathy. Dr. Ranston's book would be interesting and useful even if his presentation of the Greek side of his subject were the only feature of importance in his work. He is, of course, more interested in some of his authors than in others, and his account of Xenophanes is fuller than that of any of the other Greeks, forming a sound exposition of that philosopher's views. It is interesting to find only a couple of passing references to Heraclitus, whilst the names of Democritus and Anaxagoras do not appear in the book at all. But, from the thoroughness with which the rest of Dr. Ranston's work has been done, we may safely conclude that he has considered the views of these men also, and has decided that they have no bearing on his subject.

When we take up a book with a title like "Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom," we do so with minds prepared to find that the author has convinced himself of a close and intimate connection between the two parts of his subject, even of the direct literary dependence of the later work on the earlier. We expect to discover that occasional similarities are held to prove actual borrowing, and that resemblances which appear slight to us are strained beyond all endurance to establish a rather doubtful hypothesis. It is therefore with a deep sense of relief that we discover that Dr. Ranston has no interest in proving a case. His is a piece of pure scientific investigation, undertaken with an open mind, and carried through with a sanity and caution

which renders doubly sure any conclusion to which he commits himself. It will be very difficult to overthrow any positive position which he adopts.

These comments may be illustrated by reference to his treatment of one or two writers. He gives more space to Theognis than to any other, for he recognizes that Theognis "was for long a standard author in Greek Schools. The rising generation was taught his precepts. He was the moralist *par excellence*." The Book of Ecclesiastes contains about 220 verses, and of these over 150 are quoted in the chapter on Theognis, parallels, more or less close, being adduced from the work of that author. Yet Dr. Ranston declines to pin himself down to the dogmatic statement that Koheleth borrowed directly from Theognis. He even admits the possibility that both may have drawn on a common source, perhaps Babylonian, though he does not think this a very likely explanation of the facts. It is rather more likely that the Jew had read the Greek, but the hypothesis preferred by Dr. Ranston is expressed in the following sentences: "The thoughts of the sage were common property, and provided the texts for many a discussion among those who might be called 'the men in the street.' Working among these in the search for aphorisms (xii. 9 f.), Koheleth gathered into a sort of note-book much material which proves to be originally from Theognis."

We have already noted the very adequate discussion which Dr. Ranston gives to Xenophanes. Yet he is careful to say that in the resemblances which may be found "there is nothing for our special purpose," and begins his next paragraph "More to the point are the serious differences in thought and in outlook." With the exception of a single fragment, he finds nothing in the remains of Archilochus which could indicate a connexion with Koheleth. There is more similarity with Ecclesiastes to be found in Solon, but against this must be set the fact that where these two are alike, they also resemble Theognis, and it is he who is to be marked as the common source for both. And of many of the authors he quotes he simply has to say that an examination of their work gives a negative result.

From time to time Dr. Ranston uses the language of the Greek authors to explain obscure passages in Ecclesiastes. But even then he does not commit himself to the hypothesis of direct borrowing, preferring to believe that Koheleth found the

aphorisms popularly used by the men with whom he consorted. But he is convinced that the general atmosphere of the book is Greek rather than Jewish, and that the resemblances, though not due to immediate use of the Greek writers, are nevertheless to be traced back to them. And in reaching this conclusion Dr. Ranston has given us a most useful and valuable study, which should go far in helping us understand a very strange book.

* * * * *

Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. II. 3. Das Judentum. By D. Max Haller. 2te Auflage, 1925. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht. Pp. 24 + 363.

The whole work of which this volume forms an important part is parallel to the well-known *Schriften des Neuen Testaments* with which the name of Johannes Weiss is associated. It has for some years been familiar in this country to scholars, and has made many of us feel that it would be well if we could have some production of the kind in English. Many people would welcome a chronological Bible, though there would certainly be grave difficulties in the way of its production. It would be difficult to-day to get anything like complete agreement on the dates of some portions of the Old Testament, and the German scholars who have issued this work are to be congratulated on their harmony—though even so, there are points on which their opinions would probably differ.

The series is very far from being simply a re-arranged German Bible. It is a Commentary as well, and therefore serves a double purpose. It does not profess to give the whole of the Old Testament Text, but the "selections" are very extensive, and the reader is not likely to miss anything of first-class importance. The general plan of the whole is to take a period, and to give all the relevant literature, as far as possible in chronological order. As each new book is cited, there are a few concise paragraphs of introduction to it. Then follows a passage in a new translation based on a critical text, and then again the comment on the passage. The latter is in accordance with the principle which has in more recent years superseded the verse-by-verse method of commentary, and is therefore a great improvement on the older type of note. Anything that needs to be said about a particular word or verse can still be said, but it is obviously far

easier to grasp the meaning and message of a section of the Bible if it be read and expounded as a whole, and not as a series of detached sentences. The method is familiar to readers of the well-known Old Testament Commentaries edited by Professor Sellin, and of Peake's *Commentary*, and has proved its value in both cases. The writers have not paraded their learning ; there is no Hebrew type, and whilst textual changes are noted at the foot of each passage, the Hebrew words are transliterated. The reader observes with some relief the absence of a number of variant opinions on various disputable points ; views which the authors reject are only mentioned when they are of real importance, and even then there is little or no personal reference. The whole plan serves as a model for popular commentaries intended for the working expositor, who is not greatly interested in the minutiæ of scholarship, but is extremely anxious to know what the Bible means.

Professor Haller's volume deals with the literature referring to the post-exilic period, except for the strictly poetical books, which are reserved for a separate volume. After a short introduction he gives the section of the Book of Ezra which deals with the return from captivity, and follows this up with Isaiah xl.–lv. Next comes the building of the Temple, with Haggai and Zechariah (i.–viii.). Then the further expedition in the reign of Artaxerxes I, with Malachi and Isaiah lvi.–lxvi., the Governorship of Nehemiah, and the work of Ezra. To this are attached specimens of the Priestly Law. Professor Haller then most suitably introduces two important letters from the Jewish community at Elephantine, illustrating the condition of the Diaspora at this period. This in turn is succeeded by Joel, Habakkuk, Zechariah ix.–xiv., Isaiah xix., xxiv.–xxvii., Daniel and Esther, and the volume ends with selections from the Book of Chronicles. It would have been, of course, impossible to have given the whole of all these passages, but the principal omissions are passages which are simply repetitions of others, and where there is a gap in the text it is covered by a short summary of the material omitted. For instance only those sections of Chronicles are given which refer to events not mentioned in Kings, and the selections from the Priestly Code are very brief, though sufficient to show its general character and attitude.

It is only an expert German scholar who can rightly appreciate

Professor Haller's translation, but the foreigner who is not an expert will find them simple and straightforward, often illuminating, and rising to real eloquence in some of the prophetic passages. The expository sections are brilliantly written, and are often a pleasure to read for their own sake, apart from the instruction which they afford. They are concise—the scope of the series leaves no room for garrulity—but not "scrappy," and there are times when a reader who differs from the author is almost convinced against his will. Professor Haller has succeeded extremely well in avoiding the merely commonplace note, and writes with freshness, illuminating all that he handles.

As the use of the Elephantine Paypri suggests, this volume is thoroughly up to date. The critical basis assumed in the work on the Prophets is the modern one which sees in these books collections of short pieces, usually poetical, and the kind of oracle is always mentioned. Continental scholars have gone much further than British students in classifying the various types of prophetic utterance; we have hardly yet developed technical terms corresponding to "Mahnwort," "Scheltwort," "Drohwort," and the like. One or two other interesting views may be mentioned. Professor Haller identifies the subject of the "Servant-Songs" with the prophet himself, and therefore regards Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12 as pure prediction. He follows Duhm in assigning Habakkuk to the period of Alexander the Great, and contributes materially to the strength of the theory. He places the activity of Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes I, and barely alludes to the view, rapidly gaining ground, that he is to be dated a generation later. One of the most interesting parts of his work is his treatment of the Book of Daniel. He takes the ordinary critical view, that the book is in its present form to be dated in or about 168 B.C., and contains a collection of earlier stories in Aramaic which a Maccabean editor has taken and used for his own purposes, appending other material in Hebrew. It remains to notice the skill and sympathy with which he sketches some of his characters.

In conclusion we may repeat that the whole series, and in particular this volume, makes us wish that we had a commentary in English on a similar plan and with the same scope, and it may be added that, popular as the volumes are, they cannot be neglected by any student of the Old Testament. The list of

authors includes some of the greatest of our living scholars, and their work is worthy of their reputation.

* * * * *

The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. III. Edited by J. B. Bury, M.A., F.B.A., S. A. Cook, Litt.D., and F. E. Adcock, M.A. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xxv + 821. Price 35*s.*

This volume fully maintains the high standard which has been set by its predecessors. It bears the general title of "The Assyrian Empire," but, as a matter of fact, covers a wider field than this would suggest. The history of Mesopotamia is carried down to the fall of Babylon in 538, and that of Egypt to the conquests of Cambyses. Other subjects considered include the Hittites, the Kingdom of Urartu and the early history of Greece. As in the earlier volumes, the different sections have been undertaken by scholars whose names are in themselves a guarantee of excellence. Thus the five chapters on Assyria have been written by Mr. Sidney Smith of the British Museum, perhaps our ablest living Assyriologist, and form the best history we have yet had of the period of Assyria's greatness and fall. Dr. Hogarth writes on the Hittites, Professor Sayce on Urartu, Dr. Minns on the Scythians, Dr. Campbell Thompson on Babylon, and Dr. Hall on Egypt. Early Greece is divided between Dr. Hogarth, Mr. H. T. Wade-Gery, Professor Gardner, Dr. Cary, Professor Myres and Professor Adcock.

For many readers the most important part of this volume will be that which deals with Israel. This is introduced with a chapter by Dr. R. A. S. Macalister (including three or four paragraphs by the late Dr. G. B. Gray), on "The Topography of Jerusalem." Dr. Macalister has at his disposal the results of the work of excavation on the Ophel, in which he himself has taken so prominent a part, and has written the most thorough and up-to-date account that could be given. Dr. S. A. Cook follows with chapters on "Israel and the neighbouring States," "The Fall and Rise of Judah," "Israel before the Prophets," and "The Prophets of Israel." These chapters are marked by the same features that have characterized Dr. Cook's other contributions to the Cambridge Ancient History, thoroughness, freshness, lucidity, conciseness.

Dr. Cook's earlier writings have led us to expect a somewhat

independent statement from him. He has, indeed, adopted a position which is, as far as is generally known in England, quite unique. Whilst, like every other critic, he accepts the main outlines of the Graf-Wellhausen documentary analysis, he has a new date to offer for some of the documents. In recent years attempts have been made to re-date Deuteronomy, some scholars placing it very much later than the seventh century, and one other, at least, very much earlier. Dr. Cook is nearer to the former school, though he is not inclined to put Deuteronomy, even in its present form, much later than the sixth century. But he finds reasons for believing that not only D but also J and E are properly to be assigned to the sixth century, that is, roughly, to the period of the Exile. This age is, in fact, the key to the whole of Israelite history and literature. The wide differences in style and outlook between JE and other writings may, he thinks, be explained by a difference in *milieu* quite as well as by a difference in date.

Dr. Cook is brought to this conclusion by the contrast between the theology and moral standard of JE and those which existed in all circles, prophetic included, down to the time of Amos. He has to admit, of course, that absolute certainty is not easy to attain for events earlier than the middle of the eighth century, but, nevertheless, he feels himself on fairly safe ground in the picture he assumes of Israel during the earlier monarchy. Whilst he allows a high degree of credibility in general to the historical books, he feels that down to the Exile the Canaanite element in Israel was much stronger than has sometimes been supposed, and that Canaanite culture, religion, law and social order were predominant. Even polytheism—and here he has the Elephantine papyri to support him, as well as references in the Bible itself—was not condemned as illegitimate by the great mass of the people and of the prophets. There is no trace of acquiescence in any such doctrine in JE. Where the religious standard reflected in these documents falls short of the ideals of the later Judaism, the difference is in the conception of Yahweh and in the mode of his worship, not in the demand for monolatry. It is not only Deuteronomy that is dependent on the great eighth-century prophets ; J and E are equally indebted to them for their point of view.

Whether we agree with Dr. Cook or not, it is impossible not to

feel that his case has been put brilliantly and with force, and the considerations which have led him to his results are marshalled with impressive ability. It may even be possible that we could have formed a fairer judgement on the hypothesis itself if the case had been less effectively put; as it stands it is difficult to criticize it from the outside. But this new theory of the date of JE is far from being the only important contribution Dr. Cook has made in these chapters. He tells the story of Israel as far as he can reconstruct it, clearly and attractively; perhaps it has never been so well put before in so short a space. Best of all is the treatment of the Prophets, and in his discussion of the "Servant Songs" he reaches a height that few if any others have attained. We may venture to hope that he has yet greater things to give us.

In conclusion it should be remarked that everything has been done to make this volume a useful work of reference. No less than 120 pages are given to Bibliographies, Chronological notes and Indexes, while there is an ample supply of maps and plans through the volume. If a criticism may be offered, it might be more comfortable for the reader if Biblical and other references were relegated to the margin instead of being inserted in parentheses in the text. But this is a minor point which may be rectified in a later edition. T. H. Robinson.

* * * * *

Il Salmo d'Oro. Itinerario di Vita Mistica. By Dr. Piero Chiminelli. Roma: Casa Editrice "Bilychnis." Pp. xxii, 180. Price 10 lire; abroad, 18 lire.

This is a devotional exposition of the twenty-third Psalm by a scholarly Baptist pastor in Rome. Professor Taglialatela, who writes a preface, recalls the old division of the servants of God's Temple into the apologists, who defend it from assault, the evangelists, who invite the passers-by to enter, and the exegetes and mystics, who dwelling within are able to exhibit its treasures to those who come; and he insists that in this work Dr. Chiminelli notably appears as one of the last class. He adds an interesting note about Italy that the assaults upon Christianity and the religious sentiment in general are much less violent and aggressive than they were, and that there is thus a diminished need of apologetic, but there is more need than ever of devout and living exposition. So much devotion, he complains, consists of

"acts and thoughts which were once alive," that a peculiar honour is due to "a devotion which has kept company with life, and responds to the needs of human souls on this world and to-day."

Dr. Chiminelli's training was in America, and thus many of the authorities referred to are in English, but he is not enslaved by these. With real and often moving homiletic skill he holds on his own way and makes his own impression. It is a preacher's work, and should be welcomed both for its direct value for any reader and as a hopeful sign of the times in Italy. W. M. M.

* * * * *

The Spiritual Genius of St. Paul. A Contribution towards the Reinterpretation of his Message. By D. M. Ross, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. xv, 254. Price 7*s.* 6*d.*

In this volume Dr. Ross supplements his previous work on "The Faith of St. Paul," in which he argues that Paul's teaching is not in any sense a departure from that of Jesus but a faithful reproduction of it. He was "dependent upon Jesus for the spiritual experience in which his whole life as a Christian was rooted," and the main purpose of his writings was to expound the experience thus derived. In sharp contrast to Wrede and many other scholars who account for Paul's conclusions by referring to theories he had found in Jewish theology and elsewhere, he boldly goes with A. B. Bruce in treating them as "psychological and autobiographic"; and what he attempts in this new work is to explore the religious value of some of the great phrases in which Paul's "spiritual genius finds expression." "God revealed His Son in me," "there is a new creation," "the spirit giveth life," "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts"—these and many others come up in turn for treatment so as to cover the field of Pauline teaching, and to show that at every point we have to do not with logical inferences but with experiences and the teachings and the influence of Jesus.

It may be questioned if, at the outset, Dr. Ross does not lay undue stress upon the purely ethical interests in Paul's mind. To say that "as a Pharisee his ruling ambition was to be a good man" is, in some degree, a common-place; but in spite of phrases in the 7th chapter of Romans this is less than a complete account of his ambition and his defeat. The master impulse, which continually urged him on in his quest, was the desire to be a friend of

God; and the trouble which perplexed him was that, however blameless he was, he could not attain to absolute frankness and fearlessness in God's presence. The question was religious rather than purely ethical: it concerned his relations with God much more than the quality of his conduct or temper, and accordingly in his Christian teaching justification (that forensic term in which a man's individual relation to his Judge is paramount) is pushed to the front. But if there is any overstress at this point, Dr. Ross makes noble reparation in section after section of his book. When he speaks of the Cross as exhibiting the love of God, he notes the danger into which many preachers have fallen of presenting men with two Gods—One stern, inexorable, a Judge, and the Other merciful and gracious, a Saviour, and he adds: "That is not Paul's interpretation of the Cross." God "lives in the perpetual giving of Himself," as Pringle-Pattison says; "He shares the life of His finite creatures, bearing in and with them the whole burden of their finitude, their sinful wanderings and sorrows, and the suffering without which they cannot be made perfect." And it is thus that Paul had learned from Jesus to think of God.

The book is rich in careful and religious interpretation, and should increase the debt which so many already owe to Dr. Ross. He writes not merely for preachers and theologians but for the wider class of "earnest minded men and women who are perplexed by one and another feature of current interpretations of Christianity, and who are feeling for a re-interpretation which will be more in harmony with the mind of the Master."

W. M. M.

* * * * *

Textkritische Studien zum Alten Testament. I. Das Buch Hiob. By M. Th. Houtsma. E. J. Brill (Ltd.), Leyden, Holland. 1925. Pp. iv, 98. Price fl.3.

The Book of Job appeals naturally to anyone who seeks to emend the traditional text of the Old Testament; in no book are the problems of textual criticism more numerous and varied and baffling, not even in the Psalter. Professor Houtsma's monograph is a running commentary on the text, wherever that deserves attention, in his judgment. The edition to which he refers most often is Torczyner's (1920). But he generally gives a new verdict of his own, concisely and independently. It is very difficult in a review to do justice to a monograph of this kind,

which is so rich in detail. Professor Houtsma's mastery of the subject is plain; his essay will require to be used carefully by anyone who studies the book of Job; but all one can hope to do here is to direct attention to its general aim by noting one or two examples of its method and its results.

That (*a*) the text has suffered badly in the course of transmission, and (*b*) that transpositions of the text are sometimes needful, are assumed as axioms. This is correct. But Professor Houtsma goes beyond most critics on the line of (*b*), by holding that some fragments of the original have drifted into other books. For example (pp. 65, 66) the famous Protestation in xxxi. is held to have originally included not only xxvii. 2 f. but Psalm vii. 3–4. Now the seventh psalm does include foreign material; verses 6–13 are an awkward interpolation. But vii. 3–4 is perfectly relevant to the lyric, and I see no reason why it should be carried over into Job xxxi. Different writers could surely utter the same protest. No one author has a monopoly of this religious affirmation of innocence. Here I think Professor Houtsma is unconvincing. I am more interested to note how often his findings tally with the positions which I was led to adopt in my Old Testament Translation, e.g. in transpositions like xxix. 21–25 between 10 and 11, iii. 16 to follow iii. 11, v. 6–7 out of their proper place, xiii. 28 after xiv. 2, xvi. 10–11 out of their true place, xxvii. 3 introducing xxvii. 6, xxxi. 23 after xxxi. 14, xxxiii. 4 after xxxiii. 6, xxxvi. 31 after xxxvi. 28, xl. 3–5 introducing xlii. 1–6, etc. Some of his other suggestions look more ingenious than necessary. After all, the book is a poem, and a dramatic poem is not a logical or historical statement, where repetitions and echoes are out of place. Thus we need not put ver. 18 after ver. 20, in ch. vi. Nor am I impressed by the argument that xxix.–xxx. stood originally at the beginning of the book, before ch. iv.

A bold textual change is proposed in viii. 4: read *banô* for *banekâ*, the allusion being to the *b'ne Elohim*, cast out of heaven for their sin. Also, viii, 16–19 is taken as the description of a plant, which originally lay after xiv. 9. It is proposed to restore xv. 7–8 to its original position as an introduction to xxviii., a chapter which Professor Houtsma correctly takes as spoken by one of Job's friends. The order as well as the text in xxxii. is a well-known difficulty; it is partly, but only partly right, to

arrange it thus, 6–9, 16, 12, 10–11, 13–14, 17–22, omitting ver. 15 and the first clause of ver. 12; and, while the second line of ver. 22 is difficult, to re-write it as "and I will not dissemble" may make everything "logische und klar," but at too serious a sacrifice.

Professor Houtsma (pp. 86 f.) throws out a daring theory about xxxviii. f. It represents a Job who once with satanic pride challenged God and was punished for his presumption, a Job who was no patient sufferer but a *son of El* who had to be dealt with for his ambition. The original dialogue contained a speech of his which has been lost, but which led up to the Almighty's reply in xxxviii. f.

What has been said will be enough to show that this is a distinctly fresh and independent piece of work. The only English works which resemble it are the commentaries by Dr. Moses Buttenwieser and Dr. C. J. Ball, both of which, especially the former, re-arrange and re-write the traditional text freely. But Professor Houtsma's work may almost be called sensational.

* * * * *

S. Aurelii Augustini, Episcopi Hipponensis, De Civitate Dei contra Paganos Libri xxii. Edited with an Introduction and Appendices, by J. E. C. Welldon, D.D. Two volumes (Vol. I, lxi + 508; Vol. II, 707 pp.). London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924. Price 42*s.* net.

The publication of a commentary on the *City of God* is an event of more than ordinary interest, and one on which British scholarship is to be congratulated. Outside of the Bible, there is probably no single work which has exerted a more enduring and penetrative influence on both medieval and modern thought than this comprehensive and many-sided treatise. And even the exception we have mentioned may be to a considerable extent discounted, for it is true to say that, in the earlier Middle Ages at least, the *City of God* was universally read and known, which the Bible was not. Ambrosius Autpertus, writing about A.D. 780, has to invoke papal authority in defence of Scripture-reading,[1] but Augustine required neither defence nor advertisement. Saving only in Aristotle, he found, during the Middle Ages, no rival in nurturing and directing men's opinions, partly because of

[1] *Inquiunt multi; "non est tempus iam disserendi super Scripturas,"* etc. P.L. 89, 1268.

the circumstances which made him the last great representative of a quickly passing order and the first transmitter of its heritage to the new, and partly because the topical, almost journalistic, nature of his writings and the rich, ununified character of his mind made him a copious, stimulating parent of opinions the most diverse and parties the most irreconcilable.

It is just this many-sided richness, this all-inclusiveness of a work which for fourteen years was Augustine's task for the leisure hour and came to form a commonplace-book reflecting his interests and development that render a commentator's work so difficult. The circumstances which prompted its undertaking; the condition of paganism and, not least, of the pagan forms of religion; its relation to his other works and, necessarily, the meticulous consideration of the Augustinian terminology, so pregnant and yet so fluid; its influence upon the theology, politics and historiography of later writers and thinkers from Orosius down to at least Bossuet, not excluding that influence which, indirectly perhaps but still so incalculably, it exerted in Andrew Melville and George Buchanan and through them upon Presbyterianism, that protest of the scission between the City of God and the City of the World in which the Augustinian antithesis reached such a vehement and exotic consummation—all these are indispensable portions of the labour of an editor who would see his text in its proper setting and adequately set it forth. Add to this the need of mastering and controlling the various examinations to which the book has been subjected even during the last generation, and the immensity of the task is apparent. And it still grows, for with the comparatively recent development of interest in the history of political thought and the recognition that politics and religion are, or were, indissolubly one, Augustine's treatise has become more than ever the centre of investigation and discussion.

This ideal may well seem high, yet it is not more than the greatest of all Augustine's works demands, nor more than is humanly possible. To declare that Bishop Welldon's edition falls short of it is not to minimize its usefulness, still considerable though limited, but only to maintain that, when the exactions of scholarship are as rigorous as they are to-day, few men, if any, can reach excellence both as scholars and as divines. Where, in our opinion, he has failed is in the clear formulation to himself of the class of students whom he wished to serve. For the elemen-

tary, we conceive it would have been wiser not to have attempted so much, to have selected a book, or a series of books, preferably from the constructive section, and to have edited these with a fullness of comment and illustration impossible in a volume already great in weight and size. For the advanced, the omission of the Latin altogether, procurable in the cheap and handy third edition of Dombart (an edition unfortunately neglected in the construction of the text here presented), and the utilizing of the space thus made available, for an exhaustive and detailed commentary, would have made his labour no more difficult and much more serviceable.

For, on the whole, commendation and gratitude must be offered for what he has done ; the disappointment is only for what his edition lacks. The introduction compresses into sixty pages much information and guidance that are both sound and useful : the discussion of Augustine's knowledge of Greek is balanced and in the main correct, but it is far too short, and reveals—what is elsewhere apparent—that Bishop Welldon does not know the most recent and adequate examinations of this problem. Again, the attitude of Augustine to pagan learning is usefully discussed but in much too compressed and general a manner. The same is true of the statement of the influence exerted by the *City of God* : two pages are quite insufficient, when the reasons for reading and editing the treatise are mainly to understand what that influence was, how it expressed itself and what were its fruits. And we doubt whether Bishop Welldon's view that the antithesis between the divine kingdom and the world is quite so peculiar to Christianity as he supposes or that it would have been unintelligible to paganism. This dichotomy, real or apparent, is surely foreshadowed in the Platonic ideal world which penetrates and mingles with the world of sense ; and it is probably no less noticeable in the Stoic theory of the Cosmopolis which stands over against the adventitious city of one's birth. Seneca is by no means the only author of pagan times who uses the conception of the *duas respublicas*,[1] and, while this parallel is rather in form than in content, there seems no reason to doubt its influence upon St. Paul and through him upon Augustine. And it seems a misunderstanding of the whole spirit of later paganism not to recognize those other-worldly strivings in its philosophy and

[1] *Dial.* 8. 4. 1. The example which comes most readily to the memory is, of course, Marcus Aurelius' " Dear City of Zeus " (4. 23).

religion which it could neither appease nor satisfy. Christianity did not simply create these needs but it counted for much in its triumph that it gave them adequate recognition and ample satisfaction.

With the annotations provided by Bishop Welldon few will confess themselves content. They have perhaps been compressed by the wish to keep the book within reasonable bulk, but they are altogether meagre and jejune. There is, upon the whole, only one direction in which they do more than meet the schoolboy's needs and that is in the comparison of Augustine's Biblical quotations with the original Greek. Here the editor has copiously—perhaps too copiously—cited the original, and paid too little attention to the Latin text actually in Augustine's hand and mind. This is symptomatic of the commentary: it makes no effort to provide more than superficial information and is almost entirely destitute of real and solid guidance in the tackling of the many serious problems raised by the subject-matter. Not that the notes are valueless, far from it. But in substantial comment and penetrating criticism or assistance they are almost wholly lacking. Here and there are to be found quite good sketches of points of detail in Augustine's language, such as those on *instrumentum* applied to Scripture, and the Augustinian use of *sacramentum*, yet such are comparatively rare. The text itself is a reprint of the Vienna edition, the editor apparently not knowing of Dombart's third edition of 1908.

The various appendices discuss such matters as *The City of God*, Augustine's literary style, his theory of the Church and of sacrifice, the Church and the stage, etc. It is quite in keeping with Bishop Welldon's sympathies that the last-named should be the longest, and should be a careful and interesting account of the relations of religion and drama covering practically the whole Christian era. Not all of it is relevant and by no means all has been said that might be concerning the stage in the Africa of Augustine's time, but it is easy to see that it is a favourite topic of the Bishop's and much may be forgiven him. The index includes only proper names; there is no *index Latinitatis* and, more surprising, none of Scripture. The reading of proofs has been negligent: there is a glaring misprint on the fly-title to Book I, misprints in the Latin text (e.g. Bk. IV, 32) and in the notes (I, p. 140, n. 6, " Lucan " for " Lucian "; p. 396, n. 5 *uocarmus* for *uocamus*). And *Hipponensis* is regrettable.

But the reviewer of these two bulky volumes must confess that criticism is disarmed by the remembrance of what they have cost their editor in both time and money. Bishop Welldon has spent twenty years in collecting his materials, and has accomplished the lengthy task of reading through all Augustine's works. Moreover, we believe that the actual publication of his edition was possible only by his paying £500 from his own pocket towards its costs. It is a lamentable thing that when the student has given freely of his best, the fruits of his labours should be made available only on such conditions, which are nothing less than punishing and fining him for his devotion to learning. This consideration renders it invidious to criticize and mean to complain. Editor and publisher have disinterestedly attempted a great enterprise, and, if we would fain have seen its execution on another scale or in different proportions, we are none the less glad that they have done so much and cannot fail to find their example an encouragement and their work, even when most qualified, of undoubted use.

J. H. Baxter.

* * * * *

St. Augustine's "City of God": A View of the Contents. By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1925. Pp. 119. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*

This summary of the contents of the *City of God* was written before Bishop Welldon's edition had appeared. There are, therefore, three recent works in which that great and somewhat loosely built classic is synopsized: Figgis's *The Political Aspects of Saint Augustine's "City of God"* (pp. 4–29), Welldon's edition, and now this. The last will probably be found of most service to the general reader. Figgis's précis is much more compressed, and naturally has an eye upon its author's special purpose; while Welldon's introduction is of wider scope than Rickaby's and is therefore less a summary of contents than an effort succinctly to follow the thread of the argument. Rickaby naturally differs from Welldon in his emphasis on certain points and in his dogmatic position, but on the whole he has given a very fair and very serviceable synopsis, which will be the quickest means of reference we have to the *City of God*. It would have been still more useful to epitomize this epitome by the provision of a full index of matters, and if, as the utility of the book would warrant, a second edition is eventually called for, an adequate index would more than double its value.

J. H. Baxter.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. H. J. Allen, M.A.
The Apocalyptic Discourse in Luke xvii. . . . 59

Professor John Baillie.
Review 229

Rev. Professor J. H. Baxter, B.D.
Reviews 468, 472

Rev. W. H. Cadman, B.D.
Review 227

Rev. J. R. Cameron, D.Phil.
Jesus and Art 265, 349

W. W. Cannon.
Some Notes on Nahum 102

Rev. A. K. Dallas, M.A.
A Great Book on Prayer 133

Rev. H. J. Flowers, B.D.
The Fourth Commandment 183

Canon J. Gamble.
The Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel 50

Rev. W. W. D. Gardner, B.D.
An Utterance of Solomon 430

Rev. D. W. Greenfield, M.A.
Reviews 394

Canon J. Battersby Harford, M.A.
Since Wellhausen 4, 83, 164, 244, 323, 403

Rev. E. W. Johnson.
Symbols and Sacraments 36

PAGE

Rev. Professor W. M. Macgregor, D.D.
Reviews 225, 464

Rev. Professor R. Mackintosh, D.D.
An Open Letter on the Atonement 161
Reviews 389

Rev. F. J. Moore, B.A.
The Cry of Dereliction 206

Rev. L. A. Muirhead, D.D.
Reviews 154

Dr. J. P. Naish.
The Ten Best Books on Proverbs 111

Rev. Principal John Oman, D.D.
The Apocalypse 437

Rev. H. E. Probyn, M.A.
The End of the Gospel of St. Mark 120

Rev. O. S. Rankin, B.D.
An Utterance of Solomon 430

Rev. H. Ranston, D.Litt.
The Orphic Mysteries 141

Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D.
Reviews 452

Rev. Professor C. A. Scott, D.D.
The Ten Best Books on Prayer 26
Review 68

Rev. Ian G. Simpson, M.A.
The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel 292

Rev. R. Strong, M.A.
Works and Fruit 309

Rev. Vincent Taylor, D.D.
The Lucan Authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts 282

INDEX TO BOOKS REVIEWED

PAGE

Abrahams, *The Glory of God* 385
Bandas, *The Master-Idea of S. Paul's Epistles* . . . 389
Brun, *Die Auferstehung Christi* 379
Buonaiuti's *Ricerche Religiose* 225
A. T. Cadoux, *The Gospel that Jesus Preached* . . . 389
C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* . . . 381
Cambridge Ancient History (Vol. III.) 462
Chiminelli, *Il Salmo d'Oro* 464
Clarke, *Ascetic Works of St. Basil* 386
Dupont, *Le Fils de l'Homme* 227
Fairweather, *Jesus and the Greeks* 154
Goguel, *Jesus de Nazareth, Mythe ou Histoire ?* . . . 72
G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* 452
Guy, *Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus ?* . . . 157
Haller, *Das Judentum* 459
Hart-Davies, *Jonah* 454
Houtsma, *Das Buch Hiob* 466
Hutton, *The Greek Point of View* 396
Jauncey, *The Doctrine of Grace* 384
Jehudah Halevi, Poems of 387
Kraft, *Die Evangelienzitate des heiligen Irenœus* . . . 316
Matthews, *The Gospel and the Modern Mind* . . . 229
Miró, *Figures of the Passion of Our Lord* 315
Moffatt, *Everyman's Life of Jesus* 68
Olsson, *Papyrusbriefe*. 317
Orchard, *Christianity and World-Problems* 394
Plooij, *The Liège Diatessaron* 380
Ranston, *Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature* . 456
Rawlinson, *Gospel according to St. Mark* 378
Rickaby, *Augustine's City of God* 472
Ross, *The Spiritual Genius of St. Paul* 465
Wade, *Micah, Obadiah, Joel, and Jonah* 454
Welldon, *De Civitate Dei* 468
Willrich, *Urkundenfälschung* 70
Wood, *Life, Letters, and Religion of St Paul* . . . 159

INDEX TO SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

	PAGE
Aaron's Turban	274
Acts i. 6–11	125
Acts i. 15, 25	375
Animals, Kindness to	312
Art, Jesus and	265, 349
Atonement, The	161
Baptism for the Dead	225
Boanerges	375
Colossians ii. 2	62
Corinthians, Literary Illustrations to First	126, 211, 299, 362
2 Corinthians iv. 4	377
Deuteronomy	323
Deuteronomy xviii. 15	65
Divination	231
Eschatology	321
Ezekiel xx. 49	167
Fear and Punishment	17
Fishing	374
Fourth Gospel, The	50
Galatians v. 19–22	309
Genesis i. 1–2	219
Genesis	372
God's Glory	322
God's Personality	231
Gospel, The	81
Humility	242
Isaiah xxxvii. 31	373
Isaiah xlviii. 18	312
Jeremiah ix. 4	66
Jesus and Jeremiah	242
Jesus, Historicity of	376
Job ix. 12	371
Judaism	2
Luke's Gospel	282
Luke ii. 22	224
Luke xv. 11–32	63, 361
Matthew vii. 1	61
Matthew xvi.	3
Orphism	141, 223
Pilate	316
Prayer	26, 133
Proverbs i. 16–17	312
Proverbs xviii. 4	118
Proverbs xx.	67
Psalms xxix. 2	373
Psalms xlviii. 14	314
Punishment, Eternal	343
Romans ii. 21	62
Sacraments	36, 157
1 Samuel xvii. 29	372
2 Samuel xii. 3	312
Song of Solomon	152
Titus iii. 15	318
Worry	82
Zechariah i. 5	66

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London